

WYOMING.

Nora Sammon to be postmaster at Kemmerer, Uinta County, Wyo., in place of Otis Rife, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12, 1908.

DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

Frank A. Leach, of California, to be Director of the Mint.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

George W. Wanmaker, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of New York, in the State of New York.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

General officer.

Col. Charles E. L. B. Davis, Corps of Engineers, to be brigadier-general from January 29, 1908.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Stacy Potts to be a captain in the Navy from the 28th day of January, 1908.

Commander James M. Helm, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 28th day of January, 1908.

Commander Cameron McR. Winslow, an additional number in grade, to be a captain in the Navy from the 28th day of January, 1908.

Commander Isaac S. K. Reeves to be captain in the Navy from the 30th day of January, 1908.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Gaston De P. Johnstone to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1907.

Midshipman Robert L. Irvine to be an ensign in the Navy from the 31st day of January, 1906.

POSTMASTERS.

ILLINOIS.

Howard O. Hilton to be postmaster at Rockford, Ill.

Isaac W. Parkinson to be postmaster at Stockton, Jo Daviess County, Ill.

Frederick H. Richardson to be postmaster at Tampico, Whiteside County, Ill.

John R. Snook to be postmaster at Altamont, Effingham County, Ill.

INDIANA.

Albert Jerome to be postmaster at Montezuma, Parke County, Ind.

James E. Zook to be postmaster at Lima, Lagrange County, Ind.

KANSAS.

Henry Avery to be postmaster at Wakefield, Clay County, Kans.

Ernest Hoeft to be postmaster at St. Paul, Neosho County, Kans.

William A. Morgan to be postmaster at Lansing, Leavenworth County, Kans.

Joshua M. Roney to be postmaster at Norcatur, Decatur County, Kans.

Benjamin L. Taft to be postmaster at Parsons, Labette County, Kans.

MARYLAND.

Samuel Hambleton to be postmaster at Rising Sun, Cecil County, Md.

MONTANA.

Edward H. Golden to be postmaster at Walkerville, Silverbow County, Mont.

NEBRASKA.

George B. Guffy to be postmaster at Elgin, Antelope County, Nebr.

Mark J. Jones to be postmaster at Elm Creek, Buffalo County, Nebr.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

John S. Kimball to be postmaster at Rochester, N. H.

NEW YORK.

Henry B. Flach to be postmaster at Attica, Wyoming County, N. Y.

Robert Nathaniel Roberts to be postmaster at Lockport, Niagara County, N. Y.

NORTH CAROLINA.

William E. Lindsey to be postmaster at Chapelhill, Orange County, N. C.

Nathaniel J. Palmer to be postmaster at Milton, Caswell County, N. C.

Augusta Phelps to be postmaster at Plymouth, Washington County, N. C.

Jesse D. Sharp to be postmaster at Elm City, Wilson County, N. C.

James E. Smith to be postmaster at Kittrell, Vance County, N. C.

OHIO.

J. W. Bryson to be postmaster at Glouster, Athens County, Ohio.

Mary S. Hill to be postmaster at Berlin Heights, Erie County, Ohio.

Nellie F. Sheridan to be postmaster at Somerset, Perry County, Ohio.

OREGON.

Marion F. Davis to be postmaster at Union, in the county of Union and State of Oregon.

Ione McColl to be postmaster at Gresham, Multnomah County, Oreg.

George W. Spring to be postmaster at Lents, Multnomah County, Oreg.

William E. Tate to be postmaster at Wasco, Sherman County, Oreg.

William M. Yates to be postmaster at Hood River, Wasco County, Oreg.

WASHINGTON.

William H. Shoemaker to be postmaster at Hillyard, Spokane County, Wash.

WEST VIRGINIA.

James B. Campbell to be postmaster at New Cumberland, Hancock County, W. Va.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 12, 1908.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

The following prayer was offered by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, that our Republic is not ungrateful, but that she honors herself in keeping sacred the memory of her illustrious sons who, in peace and in war, gave themselves, a living sacrifice, to her honor and glory; that to-day throughout the length and breadth of our Union her patriotic sons and daughters will meet to pay a loving tribute of gratitude and respect to Abraham Lincoln, the savior of his country—strong in his intellectual powers, pure, tender, loving of heart, a patriot, a statesman, a Christian, the marvel of his age. We thank Thee for him, for what he was, and for what he did; and we most earnestly pray that we may strive to emulate his virtues and leave behind us a record worthy in Christian citizenship. And Thine be the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. PERKINS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I recollect it, when we rose yesterday a point of order was pending against lines 10 to 13 on page 52. I assume the point of order is not well taken, but as a further inducement to the gentleman from Illinois to withdraw his point of order, I desire to have an amendment read which, when the point of order is disposed of, I propose to offer in lieu of this section. I now ask the Clerk to read it simply for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the work of constructing an irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone and Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, \$125,000: *Provided*, That said sum be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States from the sale of lands made under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905. (33 Stat. L., p. 1616.)

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question? As I understand, the amendment absolutely safeguards the interests of the Government and will provide that no portion of this money in the end comes out of the General Treasury?

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the intention, Mr. Chairman, but I think I need to make a brief explanation in reference to that.

The act of 1905, confirming an agreement with the Shoshone Indians, provided for the disposal of the lands by the Government and provided how the funds derived from such sale should be disposed of. Amongst other things—I will not go into all the details about how much there was to be expended for schools, etc.—there was a provision that this irrigation system should be constructed and that it should be paid for to the amount of \$150,000, it then being thought that that sum would be ample to construct the system. It has since developed that it is not sufficient. Now, further on in the agreement there is a provision that the balance of the sum may be expended, amongst other things, "for such other purposes for the comfort, benefit, etc., of the Indians as the Indians in council may direct and the Secretary of the Interior approve."

Now, the Indians in council have not yet directed that these expenditures be made; but, Mr. Chairman, I believe that under the Lone Wolf decision we have ample authority, notwithstanding the words of this statute, to provide that this money expended for the Indians shall be reimbursed to the Treasury. I believe my friend from Illinois is familiar with the Lone Wolf decision, which, broadly stated, was that the United States had full power as the guardian of the Indians to expend their funds in any way that Congress thought wise, provided it was for the benefit of the Indians.

Mr. MANN. As I understand the matter, in the agreement with the Indians there was a provision for this irrigation plant and an agreement for the expenditure of so much money.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. I understood that that entire amount had been appropriated heretofore.

Mr. SHERMAN. For this irrigation system—that is correct also; the \$150,000 has been expended, but it has been ascertained that that \$150,000 is not sufficient to complete the system, and more money must be expended, or, under the statutes of Wyoming relating to water rights, the benefit will be lost.

Mr. MANN. How much money is this going to cost? In the first place, there was an estimate of so much, and it was supposed that the \$150,000 would be sufficient. Now you propose not to complete the system, but to appropriate \$125,000 to continue the construction of the system.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have talked this morning with the chief engineer of irrigation of the Indian Service, who assured me that not to exceed one more appropriation of this amount will be sufficient to complete the irrigation service, which will irrigate approximately 45,000 acres, which, when put under this irrigation system, will be readily worth \$30 an acre. Or, in other words, at the conclusion of this work, involving an expenditure of \$450,000, we shall have placed the Indians in possession of lands now substantially worthless, but which will then be worth a million and a quarter dollars.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman proposes to offer the amendment?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SHERMAN. Then I offer the amendment which was read a moment ago for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 10, 11, 12, and 13 on page 52 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For continuing the work of constructing an irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, \$125,000: *Provided*, That said sum be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States from the sale of lands made under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1905." (33 Stat. L., p. 1615.)

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move the following amendment, to follow the amendment just adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

That all lands allotted to Indians in severalty, or reserved for their use in common on the Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming, susceptible of irrigation, may be leased for a term not exceeding twenty years for cultivation, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, and he is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying this provision into full force and effect.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is necessary and important, in order that the lands to be irrigated under the project provided for in the preceding paragraph may be utilized. As the law now stands the Secretary can not make an agricultural lease for a longer term than five years. It is impossible in that region to secure tenants on a five-year lease. They are compelled to erect their buildings, prepare the land, and make such improvements as are necessary to make homes upon the land, and this development and settlement can

only be had upon a longer lease than is now provided for by law.

I would say that the matter has not been brought to the attention of the committee prior to this time, owing to the fact that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has been desirous of having a general provision of this character; but inasmuch as there seems to be some objection to a general provision, we are very anxious, indeed, that this provision be made with regard to these lands, and the chairman of the committee has a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, in which he indorses and urges this legislation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the communication which I have is not from the Commissioner, but from the Secretary. The gentleman from Wyoming has covered the ground in the few moments that he has occupied, so I hardly think it is necessary to have the letter read, but I will have it incorporated in the Record.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 6, 1908.

Hon. J. S. SHERMAN,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I am in receipt, by your reference for report, of a copy of H. R. 15459, entitled "A bill authorizing the leasing of Indian lands on the Shoshone or Wind River Reservation in Wyoming."

The bill authorizes the leasing of lands allotted to Indians in severalty or reserved for their use in common on the Shoshone or Wind River Reservation, Wyo., which are susceptible of irrigation, for a term not exceeding twenty years, and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry the provisions of the act into effect.

The development of the arid waste by means of irrigation has brought about a condition of affairs which makes it imperative that a more liberal law be enacted authorizing the leasing of Indian allotments and tribal lands. This is true not only of the Shoshone Reservation, but of nearly all others in the Western States. Irrigation has brought to the Indian's door something entirely foreign to his normal condition. Intensive farming means the employment of many people in a very limited space, and the Indian's objection to farming and cattle raising seems to be based, at least in part, upon his aversion to separation from his family and friends.

Under existing law it is not possible to effect a lease of irrigable lands on reservations (except on the Fort Belknap Reservation in Montana) or of allotments for a sufficient period of time to warrant the reclamation of the lands by the intending lessees.

H. R. 15459 makes it possible to lease irrigable lands on the Shoshone Reservation for such a term as would induce prospective lessees to construct irrigation systems on the lands leased, with a reasonable hope of a material profit from the outcome of their undertakings.

I believe Congress could enact no wiser law than legislation authorizing the leasing of all Indian lands susceptible of irrigation, either tribal or allotted, for farming purposes, for a long term of years.

Acting on this belief I had caused to be prepared a draft of a bill whereby this would be possible. This bill is printed in Senate Document No. 72, Sixtieth Congress, first session.

The bill inclosed by you has my hearty approval, and I respectfully recommend that it be enacted into law.

Very respectfully,

JAMES RUDOLPH GARFIELD,
Secretary.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This provides for the lease of allotted lands?

Mr. MONDELL. For allotted lands.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What are the Indians to do?

Mr. MONDELL. It is impossible for the Indians, no further advanced in civilization than they are, to cultivate 160 acres each. They cultivate small areas. It is not possible at this time, and probably will not be in the near future, to get the Indians to cultivate all of their holdings. Now, as my friend knows, under the laws of irrigation regions there must be a continuous application of water in order to preserve the water rights. So this is not only in the interest of the Indians to give them an income, but it is necessary in order to preserve the water rights for them. Of course the Secretary of the Interior will, in the exercise of his discretion, lease only such lands as the Indians are not able to cultivate themselves, or such as they can not be persuaded to cultivate.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is the irrigation project provided for in the preceding section contemplated for the irrigation of unallotted lands?

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all. At least no considerable area of such lands.

Mr. HINSHAW. The proposition is to lease the allotted lands?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand the gentleman from Wyoming to be in favor of leasing Indian lands so that the Indians may derive a revenue therefrom.

Mr. MONDELL. That is my thought.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, and I have a bill pending be-

fore that committee providing for the lease of the general public lands of the United States so that the United States may derive some benefit from them.

Mr. MONDELL. That is quite another question.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman explain why he is in favor of the leasing of the lands of the Indians to give them some benefit and is not in favor of a lease of the general lands of the United States?

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman's question is not germane to this discussion. I would be glad to answer it at the proper time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is the intention to leave it to the Secretary of the Interior to determine what shall be done with the proceeds of the leases?

Mr. MONDELL. The proceeds in every case, following the general law, will be used for the benefit of the Indians. We do not in any way change the general provisions of law providing for leases. We simply extend the period and make new provision as to how the money shall be paid to the Indians. It is not intended to go into that question at all, but simply to give the Secretary the authority to make a longer lease.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point of order, I would like to ask the gentleman whether his amendment is the same as the bill.

Mr. MONDELL. It is; the amendment is the bill.

Mr. MANN. The bill does not refer merely to allotted lands. I ask that the amendment may be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. HACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What is the original term of restriction as to this land?

Mr. MONDELL. On alienation? Twenty-five years.

Mr. HACKNEY. When does that expire?

Mr. MONDELL. In twenty-one to twenty-three years from now. The intent was to bring it within the period of nonalienation.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. What would be the value of this land per acre per year? How much revenue would the Indians derive?

Mr. MONDELL. I could not say. I could not even make a guess.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Two cents an acre?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, yes; I should say much more; possibly as much as 50 cents or \$1 in some cases.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Rental each year?

Mr. MONDELL. I should say so.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state that I am heartily in favor of the amendment. I think the Indians should lease their lands.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist on his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I am trying to get information in reference to the amendment, if the Chair will bear with me. The gentleman from Wyoming stated that this was intended to apply to allotted lands. The amendment does apply to allotted lands and lands reserved for other use in common. Can the gentleman tell how much land there is of that kind and what is the reason for leasing common land?

Mr. MONDELL. I will call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this provides only for the leasing of irrigable lands for agricultural purposes. Now, it is possible that there might be here and there some areas within the irrigated tracts that might not have been allotted. So far as I am concerned, I know of no objection to striking out that feature of the amendment, though I assume that it was intended to cover small tracts within the irrigated area as might not have been allotted, but the amendment limits the leases to agricultural leases of irrigated lands, so that it covers allotments principally. It might in some instances cover small areas that had not been allotted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] a question. I understand the gentleman to say that restrictions on alienation would expire in about twenty-one or twenty-two years.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. And that this limitation on the lease was twenty years, so as to bring it within that period.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Is there anything in the amendment that would prevent, eighteen years from now, the Secretary making

a lease for twenty years from that date and thereby running it beyond?

Mr. MONDELL. I don't know that there is, but I do not imagine that the Secretary will make any leases beyond a period of nonalienation. I don't think there is any probability of that being done. If it were done, however, the gentleman is aware of the fact that the lands could be alienated in any event.

Mr. PADGETT. But then they would be alienated subject to this incumbrance of the lease.

Mr. MONDELL. I don't think there is any danger of that being done. Our idea was to bring the leasing period within the period of nonalienation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to issue a patent to the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America for and covering the following-described lands, amounting to approximately 160 acres, now and for many years reserved for and occupied by the said board of missions as an Indian school, to wit: The northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, the north half of the southwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 8, township 1 south, range 1 west of the Wind River meridian, on the Wind River Reservation, in Wyoming: *Provided*, That the said patent shall not issue until the Indians of the said reservation have given their consent to the grant through their business committee or council in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior shall provide.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a Department amendment sent up by the Secretary, and his letter of transmission is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, February 10, 1908.

HON. JAMES S. SHERMAN,
Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I am in receipt, by your reference of February 5, 1908, of a copy of H. R. 16037, entitled "A bill granting certain lands in the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., to the Protestant Episcopal Church." You request a report thereon for the information of the committee.

The lands described in the bill, the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, the north half of the southwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 8, township 1 south, range 1 west, Wind River meridian, on the Wind River Reservation, have been occupied under proper authority of the Department for temporary missionary purposes by the Protestant Episcopal Church since 1888. However, they still form a part of the unceded Indian reservation, and would, in case the missionary work were abandoned, revert to the Indians thereof.

In view of the great benefit the church has rendered the Indians of the reservation named, and of the large amount of money expended in their behalf by that religious organization, it would seem that title in fee to the mission tracts should be given, as indicated.

As the bill provides that the consent of the Indians, through their business committee or council, shall be obtained before patents shall issue for the lands, it has my hearty approval, and should be enacted into law.

Very respectfully,

FRANK PIERCE,
Acting Secretary.

The lands in question have been occupied by the church in question for twenty years, and it is now proposed that title be given to the church, with a reversionary provision in case the church ever ceases to occupy the lands that they revert to the Indians. This is subject to the consent of the Indians in any event.

Mr. MANN. Is it something that the Indians are asking for?

Mr. SHERMAN. It is something the Indians originally consented to, that the church be given the occupancy of this little piece of land. The Department sent it up with the provision that it be subject to the assent of the Indians. Ordinarily the Indians are glad to have this sort of thing done. I do not know whether they have especially asked it in this case or not.

Mr. MANN. What does the church want with 168 acres of land?

Mr. SHERMAN. For buildings and probably a small farm. I am not sure but what they have a school upon this as well as a church and also a cemetery. The gentleman from Wyoming can probably explain.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in 1872, when General Grant apportioned the work on the Indian reservations among the various denominations, he apportioned the work on the Shoshone portion of this reservation to the Episcopal Church and on the Arapaho portion to the Catholic Church. The Arapahoes at that time had no head chief. Each denomination took possession of a quarter section of land assigned by the Indians. They erected their buildings and opened schools. In the case of the Arapahoes a provision of this kind was made in the bill some four or five years ago granting the Catholic Church the lands on which their school and church are established. The Episcopal people have been under the im-

pression that they had a grant, owing to the fact that many years ago Chief Washakie, of the Shoshones, gave them what he and what they considered was a grant of the tract. As a matter of fact they have only their tract. They have expended thirty-five or forty thousand dollars in buildings and they conduct a splendid school. It is the only denominational school on this reservation.

The work is of vast benefit to the Indians and is highly prized by them, and the Indians have often stated to me that Brother Roberts should have his title confirmed in this land. Provision is made that the deed shall not issue until the Indians have given formal assent to it, and it gives them only the tract of land on which they now have their school and farm, and nearly all of that 160 acres is under a high state of cultivation, and the Indians are being taught the arts of agriculture, irrigation, and horticulture on that tract of land.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, on last Monday afternoon my colleague from Hudson County in this Chamber made some remarks derogatory of the conduct of Mr. William Jennings Bryan—

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I must raise the point of order that this section does not appropriate for William Jennings Bryan. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from New Jersey may have five minutes.

Mr. LEAKE. Mr. Chairman, I hope that request will prevail, and I hope that I may have five minutes in which to reply.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman from New Jersey have five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I object unless the other gentleman from New Jersey has five minutes extended to him.

Mr. SULZER. Too late.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEAKE] may have five minutes in which to reply.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I object, unless he gets on the other side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL] by unanimous consent has been given five minutes and is recognized by the Chair.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BUTLER. I rise to state that I made an objection unless permission should be given to the other gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania did not rise until after the Chairman had announced unanimous consent was given to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL].

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. My point of order is that this amendment was not disposed of. I was going to move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the amendment to which the gentleman is speaking now. The gentleman from New Jersey is speaking by unanimous consent, and the gentleman's point of order is not well taken.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, now that the tempest which unintentionally, as far as I am concerned, was started by my taking the floor has somewhat abated, I trust the gentlemen will permit me to take my humble way in peace. A few days ago—last Monday afternoon, as I have stated—my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. LEAKE] took the floor for the purpose of criticising the conduct of William Jennings Bryan. My purpose in rising to-day is not to take issue or engage in an altercation with my colleague, with whom my relations are most cordial, but to assure this House, and through them the country, that the sentiments he expressed are not either the sentiments that I entertain or the sentiments that prevail in Hudson County, which we both represent [applause on the Democratic side], or which prevail, for that matter, throughout the State

of New Jersey. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Bryan's conduct was criticised because he possesses a knowledge of the decalogue. Mr. Chairman, it is a most amazing view to be expressed in a legislative chamber, and I have had some experience in them, that a man is disqualified from the duties of statesmanship simply because he shows an acquaintance with the ten commandments. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Rather, Mr. Chairman, is it refreshing in these days to find a man who not only boasts and possesses an acquaintance with the Ten Commandments, but what is more, one who throughout the entire course of his public career has consistently put the precepts of the Commandments into practice. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And while I concur unreservedly in the statement made, that his knowledge of the Commandments would fit him to occupy a pulpit with preeminence, I can also assure the House, reflecting at the same time the convictions of many here, that that same acquaintance will enable him to occupy with éclat the post of President of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Twice, Mr. Chairman, has the same gentleman borne aloft Democracy's banner, and although the cause that he led went down into the dust of defeat, principles that he espoused were so undeniably sound that his victorious opponents have appropriated many of them and made them the popular features of their policy. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It is said that this gentleman is engaged in the practice of corraling the delegates for the Denver convention. Well, Mr. Chairman, without questioning the truth of this assertion, we can cheerfully admit that, if it is true, it is a practice for which we have a highly distinguished precedent, for if the reports current in the newspapers are any indication of the truth, it is the very same practice indulged in by the illustrious gentleman whom my friends on the other side of the Chamber boast of as their political chieftain. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Who will be the Democratic nominee no man can with certainty foretell. The choice will be left to the untrammelled judgment of the delegates to the Denver convention. Present indications, however, point strongly to Mr. Bryan.

And so, Mr. Chairman, my whole purpose to-day is to set myself, personally, and the section that I represent, in a correct attitude before the House and the nation on this important matter.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Chairman, I have a few remarks the privilege of inserting which in the RECORD I now ask the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAMILL. I desire for the information of my fellow Members to insert in the RECORD a report of some remarks uttered by Mr. Bryan at a recent banquet in Washington, which I trust will not be considered any the less valuable because they recognize the existence and validity of the decalogue which we all revere.

Speech made by Mr. Bryan at the dinner of the united Democracy of the District of Columbia at the Raleigh Hotel, Washington, D. C., on November 26, 1907.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Toastmaster and Fellow-Democrats: I desire, in the first place, to express my obligation to the Democrats of the District of Columbia, the united Democracy, for the opportunity they have given me to thank so many of the faithful in this part of the country. I want to thank, also, the toastmaster for his more than complimentary words in presenting me to you.

If anyone ever says that republics are ungrateful, I am prepared to testify that this Republic has rewarded me far more than I deserve, for my own experience has shown how much people are willing to do for one who has nothing to offer them in return except a desire to see realized in government the principles laid down by the fathers. I think my own experience in this country teaches this lesson, at least, to the young men, that they can expect reward for all that they try to do, for I have been more than abundantly rewarded for my endeavors. When I hear words spoken as they have been spoken to-night, I feel that to sit and listen to them may to some of you suggest the question, "How can he allow the praise to go unanswered?" But one in public life has to be overpraised by his friends in order to make up for the abuse that he gets from his enemies. [Laughter and applause.]

And so when mean Republicans say mean things about me, instead of getting mad, I shall just recall what has been said at this banquet, and smile and think I am still ahead. It is the fate of those who stand in the position of leadership to receive the credit that really belongs to those who labor with them, and for eleven years I have been trying to unload upon those who have been my faithful collaborators a large part of the praise that has been given to me.

A gentleman came out to Lincoln a year ago—Senator BEVERIDGE by name [laughter]—and made a speech before the Republican Club, and he called me a dreamer. He said that the President did things, but that I only dreamed. Well, I did not pay much attention to what he said; but in a little while I read that Speaker CANNON called me a dreamer, and then I sat up and took notice. [Laughter.] A few days later I read that Governor CUMMINGS called me a dreamer. Then it began to look serious. [Laughter.] Not long after that Governor

Hanly called me a dreamer—four—and I know that my poor word would amount to little against the testimony of four great men; so I decided to plead guilty and justify. Then I began to look up the subject of dreaming, and, as usual, I went to the Bible, for I have a habit of going to the Bible when I get into trouble. [Applause.] It is the best book I know of. [Applause.] I know of no other book that contains so much truth or truth so well expressed; and then I was rather driven to it besides. I used to quote a good deal from Democratic authority, but I found when I quoted a Democrat that the Republicans would attack my authority, and they kept me busy defending the Democrats from whom I quoted. [Laughter.]

So I made up my mind to quote my Bible; and when I quote Scripture and Republicans attack my authority, I just let them fight it out with the Bible and I go on about my business.

I went back to the Bible and I found that the Bible spoke of dreamers. Joseph was the most conspicuous dreamer. You remember that Joseph told his dreams and that his brethren hated him because of his dreams; and once when his father sent him out where they were keeping their flocks in Dothan they saw him coming afar off and they said, "Here comes the dreamer," and then they plotted to kill him; and he was not the last dreamer plotted against. Finally, they said, "No, we will not kill him; we will put him down in a deep pit. We will make the father believe that the wild beasts have devoured him." And then the merchants came along and bought him. They carried him down into Egypt, and the brethren said, "Now we are through with that dreamer; we are rid of him." And the year passed, and famine came in the land, and they had to go down into Egypt to buy corn, and when they got there [applause; and a voice "They found Bryan."] they found Joseph and Joseph had the corn. [Laughter and applause.] I made up my mind that it is not so bad to be a dreamer, after all, if you have the corn. [Laughter and applause.]

But the more I studied the subject of dreams the bigger the dreamer became. John Boyle O'Reilly says that the dreamer lives forever, while the toiler dies in a day. Go into Europe and you will find great cathedrals, and back of every great cathedral there was a great dreamer, a man who had a vision of a great temple of worship. He put his vision upon paper, and then the multitude began with brick and stone and mortar to realize his dream, and sometimes hundreds of years after the dreamer's death the temple would be completed, and then people would go from all corners of the earth to look upon the building, and the dreamer's name would be known, while the toilers would be forgotten. [Applause.]

I do not deserve to stand among the dreamers. It is too great a distinction; but there was a statesman-dreamer—Thomas Jefferson was the world's greatest dreamer. [Great applause.] He saw a people oppressed, and he had a vision of a self-governing nation, where every citizen was a sovereign, and where no one dared or cared to wear a crown; and he put that dream upon paper. For more than a century the toiling millions have been building at the structure whose plans he drew—not only here but throughout the world they are building—not only in civilized countries, but in semicivilized countries, all over this globe, will you find people building away at this structure. Some day it will be completed, and then it will bring blessings to every human being. I shall be content if when my days are numbered it can be said of me, not that I was a dreamer and in the class with Jefferson, but that I was a toiler, laboring as best I could, improving every opportunity that presented itself, to advance the work on this building that he dreamed into existence. [Loud applause.]

I have enjoyed the speeches that have been made to-night. I have especially enjoyed the speech made by the distinguished Democrat from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is the recognized leader of the minority in the House. [Applause.] What difference does it make if we do not agree on some questions? I long since have learned that there can not be absolute harmony among any considerable number of people, if they think at all. If you want absolute harmony in a party you must not have more than one person in it, and then you must take the vote immediately, for he may change his mind. [Laughter and applause.] If you have two you are bound to have discord, for one will be radical and the other conservative. [Laughter.] There are as many different shades of radicalism and conservatism in this country as there are people. Speak to the most radical man in the country, and he will tell you that there are 80,000,000 of conservatives; speak to the most conservative and he will tell you there are 80,000,000 of dangerous radicals in the country. [Laughter.] In Japan I saw standing by a temple door two Korean lions; it is quite a familiar scene there, for these lions are found in front of many temples. One has his mouth open, the other has his shut. They represent the eternal conflict between the positive and the negative; between the conservative and the radical; and both are necessary. If it were not for the conservative, the radical would go too fast, and if it were not for the radical the conservative would not go at all. [Laughter.] They help each other; both are necessary in every country. I was so struck with the appearance of these lions and with their significance that I bought two and brought them home with me; I put them on either side of the steps leading up to my front door, and there they stand, the radical and the conservative; and I go in and out about halfway between the two every day. [Laughter and applause.]

I enjoyed listening to the speeches that have been made here, and particularly that made by my good friend from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], to whom I always listen with delight, and not less to that of my good friend from New York [Mr. SULZER], who, in 1896, was much more lonesome down there than he is to-day. [Applause.] And I appreciate, too, the speech made by the Tammany leader [Mr. Hagan], who comes here with his message from the untamed Democracy of New York City; and I am perfectly willing to indorse his statement that the Tammany tiger is a much more beautiful toy than any "Teddy bear." [Applause.] His reference to these political toys recalls the emblems of the two parties, and, my friends, I am prepared now to defend the donkey as an emblem for a party in preference to the elephant. I had this impressed upon my mind as I traveled through other countries. Go where you will, and you will find the donkey, and he is always at work, and he is working for the common people wherever you find him. [Applause and laughter.] He is no aristocrat. [Laughter and applause.] He is not ashamed of toil. You will find him in the mountains of the West; you will find him in the crowded sections of the Orient; you will find him along the fertile Valley of the Nile, and you will find him on the sacred soil of the Holy Land. And that patient, persistent animal is always doing something for the people. If service is the measure of greatness, the donkey's claim to distinction can not be ignored. [Laughter.] Aye, give me as a party emblem the universal donkey rather than the elephant, which can only be found in a few latitudes, and is seldom seen except on dress parade. [Applause.]

I desire to call your attention to-night to a subject of importance, one worthy of our consideration, and if I did not regard it as an important subject I would not trespass upon your time at this late hour of the evening.

I appreciate the growth of Democratic ideas. You may remember that I have pointed this out at various times—reluctantly, of course, but from a sense of duty. [Laughter.] I have felt that I ought to speak of it. [Laughter.] Some Democrats have criticised me because I have praised the President when he has been Democratic; but, my friends, no Republican President can push me off of the Democratic platform if I know it. [Applause and laughter.] I have not enjoyed myself so much in years as I have enjoyed myself in the last three, and I think I am enjoying myself to-day better than I did last year. Why, my friends, you don't know how much better I am treated now since my ideas have been made respectable. [Laughter and applause.]

I used to be afraid to let the picture papers come into my house. They had such horrid caricatures that they kept my family disturbed all the time, but now I can let nearly any paper come into the house, they are so much more polite. Collier's Weekly not long ago had a cartoon that some of you may have seen. Why, it actually represented me as a bird. Think of it! [Laughter.] You laugh, but after a man has been in the serpent class for years it is quite a rise to get among the birds. [Laughter and applause.] And this cartoon represented the President and myself both as birds. [Laughter.] But he was on the nest, and I was on the limb; and the strangest part of the picture was that his nest was feathered with feathers that I had formerly worn. [Laughter and applause.] There I stood on that limb almost naked, with just one feather left—tariff reform—and I was wondering whether he was going to take that. [Laughter.] Now, the cartoon brought out the idea, but it did me great injustice, for I have more than one feather left and others growing. [Laughter and applause.] And I am perfectly willing to raise feathers if the President will only have the good sense to use them. [Laughter and applause.]

The President has advocated some things that are Democratic, and I want to call your attention to-night very briefly to some of the things that he has advocated that are Democratic, and to some things that are Democratic that he has not advocated, and to some un-Democratic things that he has advocated.

In the first place, he has advocated the regulation of the railroads. That is Democratic. Only he has not gone as far as we think he ought to go. He has, to some extent, prosecuted the trusts. That is Democratic; but he has not prosecuted enough of them or carried the prosecutions as far as he ought to have carried them. We have had on the statute books a law making it a criminal offense, punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary, for men to conspire in restraint of trade. He has been President now for some six years, and while he has commenced some prosecutions, we have yet to see the penitentiary doors open for a trust magnate; the birth rate is larger than the death rate, and the trust family is one family that meets the President's idea of size. [Laughter and applause.] But so far as he has gone on the trust question he is Democratic. As the Republican leaders would not go as far as he wanted to go on the railroad question, so they have not been willing to go as far as he wanted to go on the trust question. He has advocated the arbitration of differences between labor and capital, and this is Democratic; but the Republican leaders have not joined him in it. He has advocated an income tax, and this is Democratic, but no prominent Republican has yet attempted to carry out his recommendation; and Secretary Taft, who has been selected as his heir-apparent, if the Roosevelt line is established, says that while he is in favor of an income tax, he does not want it just now. Now, here are four things that are Democratic; the President has advocated these Democratic policies which the Democratic party advocated for from five to twelve years before he ever spoke upon the subjects. Now, I want to give him credit, and I do gladly give him credit for what he has done in this respect. If you ask me if he is a Democrat, out of justice to him and out of justice to the Democratic party I say, No. [Laughter.]

If you ask me if he is Democratic, I will answer you after the manner of the old pioneer preacher of Illinois, Peter Cartwright. He was asked if he was sanctified, and he replied, "Yes, in spots."

And so, my friends, if you ask if the President is a Democrat, I say, "Yes, in spots." My only regret is that the spots are not as numerous as they ought to be or as large as I would like to see them. But a Democratic spot looks beautiful to me, I do not care on whom I see it. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, there are certain things that are Democratic that he has not advocated. He has not advocated tariff reform. That is Democratic, and I am sorry that he has not taken the Democratic position.

He has not advocated the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, yet this Democratic reform is so popular that five times the House of Representatives has passed the resolution necessary for the submission of the amendment and has passed it by practically a unanimous vote. That is a Democratic policy that he has not advocated.

He has not yet joined us in the denunciation of government by injunction, although the indications are favorable. [Laughter.] I say "favorable" because in the last message he said that if this injunction—this writ of injunction—continued to be abused, something would have to be done. This reminds me of a man who went to a theater on a pass. It was a very bad play, and the audience began to hiss and to hoot, but he sat still. Finally one went to him and said: "Why don't you join us in expressions of disapproval? You certainly do not like this play." "No," he answered, "I don't like it any better than you do, but I am in here on a pass. But," he added, "if this thing gets much worse, I will go out and buy a ticket and come in, and then I will join with you." [Laughter and applause.]

Neither has he indorsed the Democratic opposition to imperialism.

Now, not only are there some Democratic things that he has not advocated, but there are some very un-Democratic things that he has advocated. In the first place, he has advocated the national incorporation of railroads and other corporations engaged in interstate commerce. This is un-Democratic. It is Hamiltonian. It is the most centralizing proposition that has been presented to this country since Hamilton presented his consolidated, centralized plan of government. This is un-Democratic, and I am sure that the Democratic party will be unitedly opposed to it, and I trust that we can get enough Republicans to join with us to prevent its consummation.

This idea of a centralized government, my friends, was illustrated, in his action in regard to the school question in California. That was entirely in line with this idea of a centralized government that overrides the rights of the various States.

Then, he has advocated a ship subsidy, and this is un-Democratic. And we not only had the solid Democratic party against it, but we

had enough Republicans from the Interior States to make it certain that this year, with their reduced majority, they can not pass it through the House.

He has also advocated an asset currency, and so far the Democrats have had enough assistance from the Republicans to prevent that being carried through. He has, too, given evidence of possessing a military spirit, which is un-Democratic.

I mention some of the Democratic things he has indorsed, some Democratic things that he has failed to indorse, and some un-Democratic things that he has indorsed, because I believe that the Democrats should praise him where he deserves praise and should censure him where he deserves censure. I believe that we as Democrats should be as ready to commend him when he does anything right as we are to condemn him when he does anything wrong. [Applause.] And because I have felt free to say a good word for him where he said a good word for a Democratic idea, I have felt free to point out what I believe to be the errors in his policies. I have thought it worth while to go somewhat into detail on this; and now, my friends, I want to come to the question that I desire to impress upon your minds to-night.

I am going to assume that Democratic ideas have been vindicated. I am going to assume that the last eleven years have shown such a vindication of the correctness of Democratic principles as has not been shown in the vindication of any party in the same length of time in all the history of this country. Eleven years ago the Republican party came into power in all the Departments of the Government. It has had eleven years of complete supremacy. It has had the President, the Senate, and the House—and the Supreme Court thrown in for good measure. It could do everything it wanted to do. It could pass every law it wanted to pass; repealed every law it wanted to repeal, and enforce every law that it wanted to enforce. There has been nothing to hinder. Not only has it had supreme power, but it has been aided from without as few parties have been aided. When the Republican party came into power we were in an era of falling prices and rising dollars.

Immediately after the election there were such unprecedented discoveries of gold throughout the world that the quantity of gold now produced annually is larger than the product of gold and silver both in 1896. In the last eleven years we have had such an increase in the volume of money that to-day we have more than 50 per cent per capita more than we had in 1896, although Republican leaders then said we had enough; and with this enormous increase has come a rise in prices, and with that rise in prices has come greater prosperity. This country to-day could not commence to do the business that it is doing if we had no more money in circulation than we had in 1896. [Applause.] It has had the credit for these rising prices because the rising prices came under a Republican Administration, although the Republican party can not claim credit for the increased discoveries of gold. Not only has it had this advantage, but when it came into power we were at the end of an era of bad crops. For eleven years we have had an era of large crops—large crops, higher prices, more money, and, consequently, more prosperity—and yet this Republican party, in complete power, aided by all these things for which it can not honestly claim credit—this Republican party has gone down in popularity from a time when it claimed that almost any Republican could be elected until to-day, when Republican leaders are demanding that the President shall break the precedent of a hundred years and be a candidate again, not to save his country, but to save his party from threatened defeat. [Applause.]

Is it not strange that a party thus in power should thus fall in popularity? And is it not stranger still that the one man who is regarded as popular by his own people is only popular in proportion as he has abandoned the Republican position and adopted the Democratic position? [Applause.] Eleven years in power and the Republican party has not impressed upon this country one single Republican policy. Not one single Republican policy is as strong to-day as it was eleven years ago. The Democratic party, out of power, is strong enough to fashion the policies of a Republican President. This party in defeat has exercised more power and influence than the Republican party in the full possession of the Government. [Loud applause.]

This demonstrates the truth of what Mr. West has said, that you can not kill the Democratic party, because you can not kill the things for which it stands. The Democratic party is strong to-day because its principles are strong, and its principles have grown because they are right. How do you attempt to explain the fact that the Democratic party can look further ahead than the Republican party—can see more clearly the abuses that need to be remedied and measure more accurately than the Republican party the needs of the people? Why is it? It is a question that must arise in the mind of every reasonable man. I want to give you, if I can, the explanation; I want to give you the explanation that, to my mind, is not only a sufficient explanation, but the only explanation.

It is altogether due to the point of view. There are just two points of view when you come to consider government. One is the aristocratic point of view and the other is the democratic point of view. In the beginning of our nation's history we had two great men, and they looked at the Government from these two points of view. Hamilton was an aristocrat; Jefferson was a democrat. Hamilton did not trust the people; Jefferson did trust the people. Hamilton was afraid that the "passions of the mob" would control the Government, and, therefore, he wanted to get it as far from them as possible and have the elections as far apart as he could make them. Jefferson trusted the people, and believed that that government was best which was closest to the people. He was not afraid of the influence of the people upon their own government, for he declared that if the people could not be trusted with their own government there was no power to which God had committed the right to govern them. The ideas of Hamilton were overthrown; the ideas of Jefferson triumphed. Hamilton wanted a government in which the President would be elected for life; in which the Senators would be elected for life, and in which the governors of the various States would be appointed by the Federal Government for life. Who would dare to go out as a candidate for high office now on Hamilton's platform?

Who would dare to go out and ask to have the President elected for life, the Senate elected for life, and the governors appointed by the Federal Government for life? No one would think of going before the country on such a platform. The question is not a President for life, but a President for a third term, and even those who want him for a third term try to avoid the force of the argument against it by saying that it is only a second "elective" term. If even his own friends recognize the objection to even a third term, who would declare in favor of a President for life? And who would want the Senate elected for life? The most popular reform in this country is

the one that is intended to bring the Senate into harmony with the House in its method of election and make it more representative of the people.

A VOICE. That is it.

Mr. BRYAN. And if you think we would like to have governors appointed from Washington for life ask these Representatives from Oklahoma, whose coming has given joy to all our hearts. Ask them what they think of a carpetbag government in Oklahoma, where the officials are appointed from Washington, not for life, but only for a period of a year, and you will find the sentiment unanimous against the Hamiltonian idea and in favor of the Jeffersonian doctrine. But, my friends, this difference in the point of view between the democrat and the aristocrat not only manifests itself when you come to consider the theory of government and the methods of government, but it manifests itself also when you come to consider the structure of society and the application of political principles to the public welfare.

There is a Democratic view of society, and there is a Republican view. I say "Republican," and perhaps I ought to say aristocratic, and yet the Republican leaders of this country take the aristocratic view of society. They take the Hamiltonian view of government, and they take the aristocratic view of society. The Democrats believe that society is built from the bottom; the aristocratic idea is that society is suspended from the top. [Laughter.] The Democratic view is that if you legislate to make the people prosperous, then all those smaller classes that rest upon the people will share in the people's prosperity. But the aristocrat says, "Legislate for the well to do, and prosperity will leak through on those below." [Laughter.] That is the difference in the view point. You can not get any man to admit that he is an aristocrat, but you can prove it on him if you can get him to state his views in regard to public questions. If I want to find out whether a man is an aristocrat or not, I tell him a Bible story, and then listen to hear what comment he makes. I tell him the story of Lazarus and Dives, how Lazarus ate the crumbs that fell from Dives's table; if he is a Democrat he says, "It is too bad that we have any people who must live on crumbs," and he begins to plan for some reform which he thinks will give to every man a table of his own, so that no one will be dependent upon what falls from another man's table. [Loud applause.]

But if he is an aristocrat, what does he say? He says, "What a lucky thing it was for Lazarus that there was a Dives near." [Applause.]

Now, this is no imaginary illustration. You will find this illustration borne out in daily life. You will find people among you who are aristocratic, and they are always talking about "the captains of industry." They are ennobling the men who give work to others, and these men who think society is constructed from the top think that the laboring man ought to make every day a Thanksgiving and express his gratitude that somebody gives him a chance to work, and yet the employer will not employ a man unless that man produces enough to not only pay his own wages but give his employer a profit for employing him. When the steel trust made public its last annual report that report showed that it paid to labor \$147,000,000, while its net earnings were \$154,000,000. Its employees, on an average, not only earned their own wages, but they earned more than a hundred per cent profit on their wages for the benevolent corporation that employed them, and yet those who think that society is constructed from the top insist that every man who works for a corporation ought to allow that corporation to dictate to him what he should do in the discharge of his duty as a citizen.

In the campaign of 1896 I believe that we lost enough by the coercion practiced by these corporations to change the result of that election. We met them on the stump and defeated them by argument; we put unpaid voters against their mercenaries, paid by the largest campaign fund that was ever collected in this country, but, in spite of their subsidized press, in spite of their corruption fund, we would have won this fight but for the fact that the day before election they were able to coerce enough laboring men to change defeat into victory. [Applause.]

It depends upon the point of view from which you examine society what remedies you will suggest. If you will examine the policies of these two great parties you will find that the Democratic party has been trying to secure reforms in the interest of all the people, while the Republican party has been legislating in the interest of a few who control the great industries.

Take, for instance, the trust question. What is the position of the Democratic party? It says that 80,000,000 people are victimized by these private monopolies, and because it looks at the question from the view point of all the people, it says that a private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. It says that God never made a man good enough to stand at the head of a private monopoly and decide every day a question where his interests are on the one side and the interests of all the people on the other side. The Republican leaders are taking the side of the trust magnate. They said, in the first place, that there were no trusts, and when we brought proof of the existence of these trusts, they said: "Well, they are natural developments; they are in the line of economic progress and have come to stay;" and when we showed that they were not economic, but political; that they rested upon laws and could be destroyed by laws; when we showed that a private monopoly had its source in legislation, and that legislation could take away the foundation upon which it rested; when they could no longer defend it, they said: "This is a new question and you must not be too hasty about it; you must be deliberate and must take time to consider." Call it a new question! Why, the principle of private monopoly has manifested itself from the very dawn of history. It is merely one of the manifestations of selfishness that has been found in man from the beginning. Go back through the years and you will find instances of it.

I found when I was in the Holy Land that there was an oil monopoly there seventeen hundred years ago. You will find an account of it in the works of Josephus. He says that a man named John of Gashala got a monopoly in olive oil; and if any of you think that the rebate is the only foundation of monopoly, let me remind you that when John of Gashala got his monopoly in olive oil he had no rebates to help him. He filled two goatskins, and strapped them over the back of a donkey, and yet he raised the price of olive oil until he sold it for ten times what he paid for it; and I have sometimes wondered whether our John got his first idea of an oil trust from John of Gashala.

It is not a new idea. It is an old idea, and the reason why the Democratic party is advocating remedies that the people are beginning to accept is to be found in the fact that the Democratic party looks at the question from the standpoint of all the people, while the Republican party looks at it from the standpoint of these men who at-

tempt to control the industries of the country and then dole out wages to the rest of the people. I am willing to go down on my knees at morning and say to my Heavenly Father, "Give us this day our daily bread," but God forbid that I should compel millions of my countrymen to go down on their knees at morning and say to these trust magnates, "Give us this day our daily bread," and have them reply, "We will if you will vote the ticket we want you to." [Applause.]

Take the tariff question. What is the difference in the position of the parties? Merely a difference in the point of view. The Democratic party looks at eighty millions of consumers who are paying tribute to a small proportion of the population; and the Republican leaders pick out these few men who are supposed to be of superior importance, and insist that these men shall have a right to make the Government a business asset and collect through the Treasury Department the money that they say they ought to have in return for the service that they claim to render to the country.

I have outlined every argument which has been made in favor of a high tariff. When I began to speak on this subject twenty-seven years ago, when I was not quite old enough to vote, the argument that I heard made was "we must have the high tariff for a little while to help the infant industries until they can get upon their feet." But in a little while they got so big that they could not only stand on their own feet, but walk all over everybody's else feet; and then they had to drop that argument. Then what did they say? Why, they said that we must have this tariff, not for a little while for infants, but all the time for adults, but that we must have just enough to cover the difference in the cost of labor here and abroad. And under the pretense that they were getting just enough to cover the difference in the cost of the labor here and abroad, they got a tariff that was on an average more than twice as much as the entire amount paid to labor. And yet these men, who think society is constructed from the top, have made no move toward the revision of the tariff. I confess I can not understand how the American people have been deceived so long by the false and flimsy arguments that have been advanced in favor of a high tariff.

Go out among the people, and in most cases Democrats and Republicans can not be told one from the other. They mingle in society; they mingle in the church; they intermarry, and you will find them together about every fireside. They make their wills just alike. You can not go to a court-house and tell by the will recorded whether the man who made it was a Democrat or a Republican. The amount that he left might give you some indication, but the language of the will would not. You will find that when a Republican makes a will he counts up how much he has, then he leaves so much to one child and so much to another child and so much to another. He goes through the list, and he says just how much each child is to receive. But if a Republican made a will like he votes on the tariff question he would leave all his money to one child, and then tell the child that he hoped that that child would treat the other children fairly in the distribution. These men who will not trust their own children to be just to their brothers and sisters leave hundreds of millions of dollars to protected manufacturers of the country, and then trust them to divide it generously with the employees.

How are we to get tariff reform? From the Republicans? Why, they say the tariff must be reformed by its friends. Who are its friends? Those who think they make money out of it. And how long will it be before the men who think they make money out of a high tariff are willing to reduce the amount of money that they make? It is a vain hope, my friends. A child will get so big that it will be ashamed to nurse, and a calf will grow so large that it will finally wean itself, but no protected industry ever let go the public teat until it was pulled away by force.

They now say that we must have tariff reform *after* the next election. That is the position of Secretary Taft—not before the election, but afterwards. Well, there are just two times when the tariff can be reformed: One time is just before the election, and the other is just afterwards; and, unfortunately, these happen to be exactly the two times when the Republican party finds it impossible to reform the tariff. [Laughter and applause.] It can not be done just before the election, for that might interfere with a Republican victory, and if it wins the victory it can not do it just after the election, for that would be like flying in the face of the verdict that the people had rendered. It is only when they think they must do something, or somebody else will, that they become at all frightened, and begin to talk of even remote tariff reform. And when Secretary Taft says that we will have tariff reform after the election I am reminded of a story Senator TAYLOR tells.

I do not want to tell his stories in advance, but he has so many that he will not miss this one. It was a story of an old colored man who became very sick. He thought he was going to die, and his wife asked him if everything was clear between him and his Maker. And he said, "No; as I look up toward heaven I can see ducks and chickens and pigs and things of that kind crossing between me and the skies." She said, "I told you not to do it. We have some of them yet, and I will go out and get them together and we will send them back, and maybe you will feel easier." And he said, "Go out and get them and hurry up." So she hitched up the old mule, and just as she was about to start away to distribute the stolen goods she looked in to see how he was; he heard her and asked: "Have you sent them yet?" She said, "No; but they are just ready to go." And he said, "Never mind now, I am feeling better."

If they can get you past the election by the promise of tariff reform they will feel so much better that they will forget all about reform. If you have tariff reform at all it will come from the eighty millions of consumers and not from the few protected industries that have been fattening through public taxation.

And so if you take up the question of centralization you will find that it is a question of the point of view. The Republicans—why are they for centralization? Because the great corporations of this country want to get the power out of the hands of the States, for the governments of the States are too near the people. They want to get the Government farther away. They would rather have it in Washington than in the States, and if they could get it to London they would feel safer still. The farther they can get it away from home the better they feel about it; while the Democrats, trusting the people and looking at the question from the standpoint of the people, want to keep the Government near to the people. Democrats insist, therefore, that Federal remedies shall be added to State remedies and not substituted for State remedies. [Applause.]

Why is it that the Republicans have put off arbitration? It is because they take the views of the great monopolies that do not want arbitration. Why do the Democrats favor arbitration? Because they look at it from the standpoint of the army of employees and also from the standpoint of all the people, who are disturbed by every conflict

between labor and capital. We have just witnessed a fight between two great telegraph companies and their employees, and 80,000,000 of people have had their business interrupted while these employers have fought out their differences with their employees. If you ask them to arbitrate, they say there is nothing to arbitrate, and then they ask you, "Has not a man a right to attend to his own business?" and that question has fooled many a well-meaning man. My reply is this: If a man in attending to his own business affects only himself, he has a right to attend to his own business; but when a man in attempting to attend to what he calls his business affects the lives and happiness and the future of tens of thousands of his fellow-citizens, I deny that any man has, under such circumstances, a right to attend to his business in an arbitrary way. [Applause.]

And the same difference in point of view explains the difference between the two parties on the subject of government by injunction; and this difference in the point of view explains the difference between these parties on the subject of imperialism. The Republican leaders are looking for trade purchased at the cannon's mouth, and because they think that a few great commercial interests will be able to profit by imperialism they are willing to trample upon the principles of our Government. The Democratic party, looking at the question from the standpoint of the masses who pay the taxes and whose sons must die in the support of a colonial policy, are opposed to a colonial policy in this country.

We insisted seven years ago that the Republican party define its position and tell this country what it intended to do. It refused then. The leaders said, "We can not talk to these people when they have guns in their hands." They said, "Let them lay down their arms and then we will talk to them." And when the Filipinos laid down their arms they said that there was nothing to talk about, and we have not been able to get them to discuss the question of imperialism from that time to this, and yet they have spent more than five hundred millions of dollars in this attempt to ape the monarchies of the Old World—five hundred millions of money collected from the people has been squandered on this colonial experiment.

At a meeting at St. Louis not long ago to discuss the development of interior waterways they declared that \$500,000,000 spent in improving the interior waterways would give us an annual saving of \$180,000,000 in the cost of transportation. Yet, my friends, we have spent more than \$500,000,000 on our imperial policy, and instead of having an income of \$180,000,000 we have more than \$100,000,000 a year increase in the expenses of our Army and our Navy. We have more than twice as many soldiers to-day as we had ten years ago, and they can not justify the increase except on the ground of our colonial possessions. This has increased our Navy, and still naval experts tell us that if we do not make our Navy three times as large as it is now the "Japs will get us if we don't watch out."

I took a short vacation in southern Idaho last summer; I stayed for a week on the banks of the Snake River. I had been out there ten years before and had crossed a piece of desert upon which I never expected to see a crop growing; but within the past ten years they have put a dam across the Snake River; they have built great canals; they have reclaimed 170,000 acres of that land, and where three years ago nothing but sagebrush grew to-day they are raising 7 tons of alfalfa to the acre and a hundred bushels of oats. They have 10,000 people living there; they have one city with 1,910 inhabitants, and in it are three banks, which have deposits of more than half a million dollars. And yet, my friends, this great improvement has cost, I think, less than \$8,000,000. They are now building canals on the other side of the river, and within three years they will have 150,000 acres, and they have another reclamation scheme not far away that is now being developed by which 150,000 acres more will be brought under irrigation. Within ten years you will see 30,000 people living on this land that was but a little while ago a desert. Think of it! Thirty thousand people, and the entire cost will be less than \$25,000,000; and yet the Republican party has spent more than forty times that much on its colonial experiment, and there will never be as many Americans go to the Philippine Islands in a thousand years under a carpetbag government as are now making "the desert to blossom like the rose" in Idaho. Five hundred million dollars would reclaim every acre of arid land; \$500,000,000 would construct dams to hold waste waters in the mountains, and not only protect the valleys from overflow in the spring, but give us this water to make the land productive. Yet the Republican party, looking at this question not from the standpoint of the common people, but from the standpoint of the favored few, even to-day refuses to announce its policy upon this important question.

And so I might take up each question upon which we have been divided, upon which our parties take different positions.

It is not strange that the Democratic party should be opposed to these great campaign contributions that have corrupted our politics. I can join with Mr. SULZER in what he says in praise of the work that Hon. Perry Belmont has done in bringing this subject to the attention of the American people. [Applause.] And if any Republican says that the Democrats have a selfish interest in stopping these campaign contributions, I reply that the Democratic party can get them whenever it will sell itself as the Republican party has sold itself; but rather than enter into this rivalry, rather than to put these elections upon an auction block and sell the Administration to the highest bidder, we prefer to appeal to the conscience of the American people, to pass laws that will prevent this corruption of politics by first stopping contributions from corporations entirely and then by compelling individual contributions above a reasonable minimum to be made known before the election, that the voters may know what money is being spent, and then they will know why it is being spent and what to expect from the party through which it is being spent.

I wish I could take up each question and show you that the viewpoint of the Democratic party is that of the common people and the viewpoint of the Republican party is that of the favored few. But let me say to you that the President has done one thing for which I feel especially grateful; he has called attention to swollen fortunes. I think I have enjoyed what he has said on this subject even more than any Republican has, because I am only cussed half as much now since he bears the other half. [Laughter.] We are now companions in misery. [Laughter.]

From the high position which the Executive occupies he has called attention to the fact that we have fortunes in this country which are uneared, that are diseased, that are abnormal, that are swollen. He has not only called attention to it, but he has stimulated some of the Republican leaders—some, not many—to a discussion of this subject. Senator BEVERIDGE was quoted last fall as saying out in Indiana that it was time to put a limit to the amount of money that one man could have. Why, it shocks my conservative mind to think of "putting a limit to thrift and industry" like that. I remember what they used

to say when I talked about unearned fortunes. A hundred millions! That is Senator BEVERIDGE's limit. Possibly most of us will not feel that it is a personal attack upon us. A hundred millions! Do you know what that means? Why, the President gets fifty thousand a year, and I think it is enough, although the President bears a heavier load of responsibility than rests upon any other official in the world. If he serves four years, he earns \$200,000; if he serves eight years, he earns four hundred thousand. If he forgets all that the forefathers have taught against a third term and serves ten years, he will make a half million. He would have to serve a hundred years to make five million, and then he would have to have twenty lives and serve a hundred years in each life to make a hundred millions. We say when we read that a railroad president or insurance company president gets \$100,000 a year that it is a very big salary for one man.

But if a man was elected president of a railroad or insurance company at 21 and served for fifty years at a hundred thousand a year—served until he was 71—he would only make \$5,000,000. He would have to have more than twice as many lives as a cat and serve fifty years in each life to make a hundred million dollars, and yet we have one man who is said to have \$500,000,000. I am glad the President has called attention to this subject, for, my friends, when the people understand what is going on they will inquire the cause, and when they inquire the cause they will find that these swollen fortunes rest upon the favoritism and the privileges that the Republican leaders have been giving to a few men, because they look at society as if it were built from the top. [Applause.] And when the people have been aroused by the arguments of the President and those who act with him we shall propose to them the only permanent remedy for swollen fortunes. It may not reach the ones still in existence, and for those the inheritance tax may be good, but our plan will furnish a permanent remedy. We say, "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." We say, open the door of opportunity to every man's son, and give each one an equal chance, not only to labor, but to enjoy the fruits of his toil, and when all are given the same opportunity and protected by the same laws, then we will have no swollen fortunes to menace this country by their corrupting influence. And how shall we bring this about? I am convinced that to-day a large majority of the people believe in Democratic principles. All that we have to do is to convince them that the Democratic party can be trusted to carry out Democratic principles.

This crisis through which we are passing is going to be the last argument necessary to convince the country of the correctness of our position. Year after year they have dragged out that old fraudulent argument that they have no panics when the Republicans are in power, that panics come only when Democrats are in power, and now in the very midst of Republican rule we have a financial stringency that reaches to the remotest corners of this land. I will not blame the President as some of his own party have blamed him. I will not blame the banks that have felt justified in the measures they have taken for the protection of their resources and that of the community, but I say to you that the Republican party, which boasts it has been in power, with only two years' exception, for forty-seven years, for this party does boast of that—in all that time we have had but two years when we had the President, the Senate, and the House all at one time—this Republican party which has been in power all this time which has drawn the salaries and had the glory—this Republican party must bear the responsibility; and I charge that these Republican leaders [applause] have so linked us to Wall street that when a gambler down there gets cold the whole country must shiver until that man is warmed. [Applause.] Now, while this extremity is upon us, the only remedy that these Republican leaders propose is a remedy that will put us more completely in the clutches of these very people. You hear them discuss remedies. Do they give you any remedy for keeping directors from robbing their own banks? No. Do they give you any remedy that will keep these men from loaning money on gambling securities to advance speculative enterprises? No. Do they insist that a larger percentage of the reserves shall be kept in the vault? No. Their only remedy is to enlarge the banks' power to issue the money; to give the bank power to issue on its variable assets. Was not my 50-cent dollar bad enough? Must we have a dollar with no cents behind it at all? [Applause.]

I am so glad that at last I can be the champion of "an honest dollar." [Applause.] I am glad that I can plead for "the widow and the orphan, whose savings must not be jeopardized," and for "the laborer, in whose hands the dollar must not diminish in its purchasing power." Their only remedy is a remedy that hires a few trustees to guard the interests of the people, and then they give the people no law to compel their guardians to execute the trust. The Democratic party looks at this question from the standpoint of the people, and says that what you need in this country is to restore confidence. Aye, I, the victim of confidence a few years ago, am now the evangel of confidence to-day. [Applause.] We say that what we want is confidence, and confidence where? Confidence among the depositors who have been frightened by the manner in which the great banks of the cities have been managed, and not until confidence is restored among the masses of the people will you find a permanent relief from this panic, and prevention of similar panics in the future. But, my friends, my time is up, and I must now go to catch a train. I appreciate—

A VOICE (interrupting). Go ahead.

A VOICE. We'll stay here all night.

MR. BRYAN. I appreciate the honor that you have done me in coming out to-night. I can not sufficiently thank these good Democrats of the District of Columbia for the interest that they have shown.

Let me say one parting word. I can not say now who may be the candidate of our party next year. [Cries of "Bryan!" and applause.]

The party owes me nothing. It has amply paid me for all that I have ever been able to do for it. There can be but one reason why the party should nominate me, and I do not want it to nominate me for any other reason; and this question must be determined by the voters of the party. The only possible excuse that can be made for my nomination is, not that it will help me, but that it will enable me to help the Democratic party in the fight that it has before it. [Applause.] But, my friends, whether this honor falls to me or upon some one more worthy to bear the standard, our appeal, if we hope for success, must be to the awakened conscience of the American people.

A VOICE. Amen.

MR. BRYAN. We must go forth with an honest platform. We must go forth with an honest organization. We must go forth to make an honest fight; and we must appeal to the conscience of the country, and that conscience to which we must appeal is the most potent force known among men. Tell me that men are kept honest by law! For

one man made honest by law an hundred are made honest by conscience. For one man kept in the path of rectitude by fear of prison walls a thousand are kept in the "straight and narrow way" by those invisible walls that conscience rears about him, walls stronger than walls of granite or of stone, and I believe that our appeal will not be in vain.

It is not to be a money campaign. We can not promise any man an advantage over any other man. We can not ask anybody to loan us money in order that we may repay it out of the pockets of the people. Our fight must be made with volunteers, men who are interested in the cause, and I say to you that if I were a candidate I would rather go out and make this fight without a national committee, without a campaign fund, than to go out with a campaign fund the source of which we were not willing to divulge unto all the people of the country. [Great applause.]

And I believe that with a party standing for something, something that the people need; with a party manned by those in whom the people have confidence, and appealing to the conscience of this nation, we can not only hope for a victory, but for a victory that will carry this Government back to its old foundations and make it again what the fathers wanted it to be—"a government of the people, by the people and for the people." [Loud and continued applause.]

MR. LEAKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent of the committee for five minutes in which to answer my colleague [MR. HAMILL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [MR. LEAKE] asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. LEAKE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey, my colleague, misunderstood my reference to Mr. Bryan. I cast no reflection on his character or integrity. He refers to the decalogue. Well, this business of President-making is a serious business. A man in the White House who is radical, flighty, and unsteady can do as much harm as one who is dishonest.

The Democratic party is the great conservative constitutional party of this country. Whenever it departs from its fundamental principles it meets with certain defeat. The American people have a good judgment and usually decide rightly, so that it behooves us more than ever not to depart from our historic doctrines.

I am opposed to the efforts of some leaders in public life to discredit our constitutional form of government, under which we have been so successful these one hundred years, and set up in its stead a government of personal individuality. These leaders propose to change the personnel of the Supreme Court when that bulwark of our liberties disagrees with them.

There are evils in our country which need correction. In correcting them let us not punish multitudes of innocent men to get at a few offenders. The American business man is not dishonest; the American banker is not an embezzler. Let us punish the guilty, but give, in the language of Jefferson, "equal justice to all."

Democracy stands for that. It is against special privileges. It is conservative. Its principles are needed now more than ever before in the history of our country. Mr. Bryan can not represent those principles. His rise has been rapid because of his radicalism. He must now pay the penalty for it. He is associated with free silver, Government ownership of railroads, initiative and referendum, and Government guaranties. All of them are un-Democratic and un-American. With him as our candidate we can not get away from his policies nor can we make paramount the great fundamental doctrines of the Democratic party. We are a party of principle, while you are a party of expediency. We are opposed to special privilege. The Republican party says that it is in favor of tariff revision. Your Speaker is opposed to it and the gentleman from New York is in favor of it. Well, my experience leads me to believe that the Speaker will have his way.

We support the doctrine of Jefferson—that the States are the best administrators of their domestic affairs. I do not like the term "State rights." It is not broad enough. It should be "Home rule." Home rule in municipalities, without interference from the State legislatures. Home rule for the States, without interference from the National Government, except in those cases confided to that Government by the Federal Constitution. I wish we might have a platform with nothing more in it than the sentence of Jefferson: "Equal justice to all men," and a candidate who will reflect that motto. [Loud applause.]

MR. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman—

MR. SHERMAN. I do not surrender the floor; I simply yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

MR. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, before this bill is reported to the House I should like to make a statement in reply to some remarks made by the gentleman from New York [MR. SHERMAN] on the question of the Indian warehouse at St. Louis.

MR. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield for that pur-

pose. We have passed that provision in the bill, and the St. Louis warehouse is provided for in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York demands the floor, and is recognized.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall take advantage here also, in speaking to the pro forma amendment, simply to say that it is very pleasing to us over here to see our brothers across the aisle live in such delightful unity.

I want to say, further, Mr. Chairman, just a word to express my appreciative acknowledgment of the courteous treatment the House has given through many days to the Indian appropriation bill, which, as we all know, contains many items of really very little interest to the great body of Members of the House. I want especially here and now to express my acknowledgments to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who I expect, in anticipation of this bouquet, has left the Chamber, for the painstaking care that he has evidenced in the examination of this bill—evidenced by his remarks upon various provisions of it and his criticisms of it. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me wholesome and worthy of commendation that an intelligent, capable, and industrious Member, not a member of the committee having in charge any particular bill, should devote his time to it as the gentleman from Illinois has done to this bill. It can only produce good results. I want to say, further, that I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the gentleman from Illinois has demonstrated that his opposition has at no time been captious, because whenever he has had an opportunity to have a provision stricken out under the rules, when it was demonstrated that the provision was reasonable and fair, he has always withdrawn the point of order.

Having said this much, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted, in engrossing the bill, to make the correction of the totals which have been made necessary by amendments adopted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Pending the submission of the request, if the gentleman from New York will yield to me for a moment, I would ask unanimous consent for about four minutes of the time of the House.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well, I shall make my motion before the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want the time while we are in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will withdraw that request and allow the gentleman from Mississippi to make his request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to address the House five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the risibilities of the Members on the other side of the Chamber seem to have been aroused a few moments ago about a clash of opinion upon this side. They seem especially to rejoice in the fact that there is no rod of authority in the Democratic party whereby absolute unanimity of expression about measures or candidates can be obtained. While I of course regret that all Democrats do not always express exactly the same ideas under the same circumstances, I thought, perhaps, it would be well to emphasize before the country just at this moment the reason why the Republicans here are generally united—outwardly, at any rate—notwithstanding the fact that now and then one of them arises in his place and serves notice that if somebody does not “get out of the way he is going to be run over.” I can not express that idea any better than by reading a little piece of poetry that was produced in the Chicago Record-Herald, and of which, emphatically, I am not the author. I do not wish to be charged with all the doggerel I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is entitled “Uncle Joe’s Psalm of Life.”

And it reads as follows:

Tell me not, oh, fellow Members,
That we ought to put on steam;
Let the flame die down to embers
While we sit around and dream.
Say revision to your sorrow!
Let us fritter time away,
Acting so that each to-morrow
Finds us where we are to-day.

[Laughter.]

Talk is cheap, and time is fleetin’;
Let the foolish public rave;
It’s enough that we keep meetin’
And most gener’ly behave.
Though our critics would remind us
How to make our lives sublime,
Let us act so they may find us
Doin’ nothin’ all the time.

[Laughter.]

Whi’e the highest aim is to produce unanimity in “doin’ nothin’ all the time,” the method of procuring that unanimity

is asserted in the last verse of the “Psalm,” which has, I am sure, received the approval of the Speaker, and, for all I know, was written by him. [Laughter.] Listen to this last verse. I have no rod of authority, but “Uncle Joe” may have one. At any rate the author of these lines, which, if not poetry, might be “verse,” thinks so, for he says:

If by chance a foolish brother
Should rebel or make a kick,
Trust your “Uncle Joe” to smother
His ambition mighty quick.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LEAKE. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the committee for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, during my temporary absence in the committee room, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] made some statements which I can not let go unchallenged. He said with respect to the Indian warehouse established in St. Louis some years ago that it was unnecessary; that it was simply established as a sort of favor to the then Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Hitchcock, who is a Missourian. I am in receipt of a telegram from the Business Men’s League of St. Louis, which I should like to insert in the RECORD, to the effect that the Indian warehouse at St. Louis has done more business than the Indian warehouse at New York City during the years 1905, 1906, and 1907.

The telegram is as follows:

ST. LOUIS, Mo., February 11, 1908.

HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Republic prints Washington telegram to-day, saying FITZGERALD of New York making an attack on St. Louis Indian warehouse; merchants telephoning asking me to wire you, St. Louis warehouse Indian Bureau records will show has done more business 1905, 1906, and 1907 than New York warehouse; \$74,000 worth of shoes sold by St. Louis merchants to Indians last year through warehouse. Hitchcock interview defends warehouse on score economy to Government.

WM. F. SAUNDERS,

Manager Business Men’s League.

The reason for the large business done by the St. Louis Indian warehouse is that St. Louis leads in certain branches of trade—for instance, tobacco, drugs, shoes, and some other things—and because of the fact that our warehouse is located closer to the Indian reservations than other warehouses, the Government finds it more profitable to make its purchases there than elsewhere. This warehouse has not only not been unnecessary, but it has proved to be very profitable to the Government. Only about eight or nine thousand dollars are being annually spent for its maintenance, while the saving through its establishment amounts to more than \$20,000 a year. And as to the former Secretary of the Interior having anything to do with its establishment, let me say that this is a mistaken notion, because that supply depot was established through the efforts of the Representatives in Congress from the city of St. Louis and in response to the needs of the service.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope the gentleman will allow me to ask unanimous consent to address the committee for two minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly; I have no objection to that.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the committee for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no misunderstanding of my position about the St. Louis Indian warehouse, I will state it again. I do not recall that I stated that it had been established because of the influence of the Secretary of the Interior, but I repeat that my belief is that it was retained, not because it was necessary to the Indian Service, but because of the interest of the then Secretary of the Interior in having it retained. I have not examined the figures showing the amount of business done in the various warehouses in the last two or three years, but I remember when the investigation was made it was shown that with the warehouse at Omaha and the warehouse at Chicago there was practically no need for the warehouse at St. Louis. I have no particular interest in establishing or maintaining a warehouse in the city of New York. If it be unnecessary for the Indian

Service, it should be abolished; but I repeat what I said the other day when the matter was before the House, that I had hoped that, the chief cause for retaining the warehouse at St. Louis having been separated from the Service, it would be well to send that warehouse after the reason for its existence.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a minute?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I simply wish to add to what the gentleman from New York has said, that it is a mistake to say that the New York warehouse has not done more business in any year than the St. Louis warehouse. It is simply a question of bookkeeping in getting the amount of goods that were sent out from St. Louis. The bids have not been opened at St. Louis, but the main places for opening bids have been at New York and Chicago, and those are the two warehouses where the greater part of the business has been conducted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think those who are familiar with the facts know that the bids for the greater part of the supplies have been received at the two great commercial centers of the country—New York and Chicago—and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] is correct.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 40, at the end of line 6, to insert an amendment to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to return to page 40, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. May we have the amendment read, pending the right to object?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment may be reported for the information of the committee. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 6, page 40, by inserting at the end of the line the following:

"That the provisions of that portion of section 9 of the act of April 26, 1906, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, consider, and adjudicate certain claims against the Mississippi Choctaw Indians be, and hereby are, extended with like force and effect to the claims of Chester Howe, his associates and assigns, for like services rendered the said Indians and moneys expended for their benefit, and the court may consolidate actions brought hereunder with any similar action or actions now pending, and any judgment so rendered shall be paid as provided in said act hereinbefore referred to."

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to object to the request of my colleague, but I shall be obliged to raise the point of order against the amendment, which surely would be sustained. If the gentleman desires to discuss the subject, I will consent, but I shall be obliged to insist on the point of order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I just wish a moment to explain.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, section 9 of the act approved April 26, 1906, in part, reads as follows:

That the Court of Claims is hereby authorized and directed to hear, consider, and adjudicate the claims against the Mississippi Choctaws of the estate of Charles F. Winton, deceased, his associates and assigns, for services rendered and expenses incurred in the matter of the claims of the Mississippi Choctaws to citizenship in the Choctaw Nation, and to render judgment thereon on the principle of quantum meruit, in such amount or amounts as may appear equitable or justly due therefor, which judgment, if any, shall be paid from any funds now or hereafter due such Choctaws by the United States. Notice of such suit shall be served on the governor of the Choctaw Nation, and the Attorney-General shall appear and defend the said suit on behalf of said Choctaws.

Mr. Chairman, when the Choctaw people moved west from Mississippi, they left several thousand of their people who were entitled to lands in Mississippi if they did not emigrate.

These people were deprived of their Mississippi lands, but still remained in the State, and later the Choctaw Nation recovered judgment for the very lands they were deprived of, and it constitutes a large portion of their trust funds. (Choctaw Nation v. United States, 119 Rep., p. 1.)

When the nation decided to divide its lands in the Indian Territory, no provision was made for these people. They were full-blood Choctaws, ignorant, poor, destitute, living in different parts of Mississippi, with no agent and apparently no protector.

Largely owing to the efforts of Mr. Howe, who went to Mississippi and ascertained their condition, the committee made a provision, first for identification, then for enrollment, but obliged them to move to the Indian Territory within six months in order to secure their rights.

They had no money, no clothing. Mr. Howe secured funds to buy clothing, food, transportation, had them identified, then enrolled. In doing this, he pledged his individual credit, as well as interested his friends, and each one of these parties secured an estate worth at least \$5,000, probably \$7,000.

After getting them ready, it was discovered that the Mississippi law prohibited the moving of a laborer out of the State without the payment of his debts, making it a misdemeanor, and these Indians then came within the law. As a result, the debts had to be paid, for they had to move within the time or lose their rights.

The Government appropriated \$20,000 and moved 261 persons, or 50 families, but took those who were ready to go; the better class. The other 800 had to get across themselves or be assisted. This assistance was furnished.

When the Indians arrived in the Choctaw Nation, the good lands were all occupied. They had no houses, no place to go, nothing to eat. Homes had to be furnished and opportunities for labor secured until crops could be made and the right of possession of lands, in some instances, purchased. These valuable lands are now theirs. All that is sought is a return of the money and reasonable payment for the service upon the principle of quantum meruit. One suit involving this matter is now before the Court of Claims, authorized by act of Congress, and the purpose of this amendment is only to allow an intervention to the end that the whole matter may be decided at one time.

The adjudication of this is an act of justice. No fraud is possible. No titles are brought in question, and nothing which retards the development of Indian Territory. Under existing laws, the dishonest can avoid return of this money, while accepting its benefits, which all acknowledge. The Choctaw Nation is not interested, as it does not apply to their national funds in any way. It is a simple payment, without interest, of moneys honestly advanced, in the interest of the people and for beneficial services rendered to them.

All of these reasons caused the original legislation, and apply with equal force to the amendment offered, which tends to a correct showing of the actual and complete transactions.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is familiar with the matter, and I will yield the balance of my time to him.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, other parties have been granted the right to sue for such items as are included in this matter, and eventually this man will possibly be given the right to bring this suit, and it seems to me that it would be better to have all the suits brought at one time in order that the matter may be decided at once and in one suit. As to the justice of Mr. Howe's claim, I am not so familiar with it. He has a right to have his day in court and a determination as to whether his cause is a just one.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Has he a contract approved?

Mr. CARTER. I do not think he has.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Under the law his contract must have been approved by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we go back to page 39 in order to insert an amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let the amendment be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman send the amendment to the Clerk's desk?

Mr. BYRD. I think I shall have to read it myself. It is as follows:

Insert between lines 12 and 13, page 39, the following paragraph: "For the support and education of the Choctaws in Mississippi, \$50,000, the same to be paid per capita to said Indians after their enumeration by the Interior Department."

Mr. SHERMAN. I object, Mr. Chairman, to going back. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended be passed.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent to be heard for three minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may extend his remarks.

Mr. BYRD. But I have made no remarks to extend.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may incorporate in the RECORD the thoughts he has in his mind which he was going to voice. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PERKINS, Chairman of

the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15219, the Indian appropriation bill, and had agreed to certain amendments and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there any demand for a separate vote on any amendment? If not, the amendments will be considered in gross.

The amendments were considered and agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent sent that in engrossing the bill the Clerk make the corrections in the totals made necessary by the adoption of the amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERMAN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 16872), introduced by me to make Lincoln's birthday a public holiday, and to consider the same in the House at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SULZER. Oh, let the bill be read.

Mr. PAYNE. I demand the regular order.

Mr. SULZER. In my opinion Lincoln's birthday should be a legal holiday, and I hope the gentleman from New York will withdraw his objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands the regular order, which is equivalent to an objection.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move you, sir, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16882), making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the senior minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, as to what disposition of time he desires.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that our side of the House prefers that general debate should be unlimited at this time, and I hope the gentleman in charge of the bill will consent that general debate shall run until further orders.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is acceptable. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be divided equally between the two sides, I to have charge of the time on this side, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] to have charge of the time on the other.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate should be controlled one-half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] and one-half by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether it is the intention to proceed with the reading of this bill under the five-minute rule to-day in any event?

Mr. BINGHAM. No; not to-day.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. LAWRENCE in the chair.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I shall take five minutes in what I desire to say. At some hearings the other day in the Ways and Means Committee room, in the presence of the Speaker of this House and myself, I made some remarks which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] thought were unjust to him. I certainly desire to do no injustice to Senator BEVERIDGE or to anyone else. I spoke what I thought was the fact, and the whole thing I think is well stated in a letter which I have just received from Senator BEVERIDGE. If I had received the information contained in his letter before I made the statement, I certainly would not have made it. He says:

In the hearings of your remarks before the delegation of manufacturers and producing interests just laid before me you say, referring to my bill—

I desire to state, Mr. Chairman, that I referred both to his bill and to the bill introduced by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER], a Member of this House, which bills were identical on the subject of a tariff commission. I continue to read from Senator BEVERIDGE's letter:

In the hearings of your remarks before the delegation of manufacturers and producing interests, just laid before me, you say, referring to my bill, "Probably you know something about their origin and where they were drawn." I take it that you would not knowingly make a statement from which a false impression could be drawn; and I think it only proper that before you made that statement, you should have asked me personally. Since you did not, I have to inform you that the bill was drawn in my office by myself; was dictated to my stenographer, Mr. Goetz; was afterwards revised and redrafted by myself in my study at my home, again being dictated to the same gentleman; that I am the author of the bill in every word, line, punctuation mark.

Since your remarks indicate that the bill was drawn somewhere else by some one else, and that it had its origin in some other mind, I trust that you will correct your statement in as conspicuous a way as you originally made it.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, permit me to explain briefly the amendment to the Indian appropriation bill offered by me a few moments ago, and which, on account of a point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN], I could not then explain.

I seek by this amendment to secure an appropriation of \$50,000 annually for the support and education of the few remaining Choctaws in the State of Mississippi, numbering at this time about 350. No one acquainted with their present condition, or with the policy of the Government in dealing with these unfortunate people, would for a moment question the justice of this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with these remarks, I would like to advise the House of a few things to the credit of this fast dying race. A few centuries ago their warriors might have been numbered by thousands, roaming over the great southwestern valley, boasting that their domain reached from the rising to the setting sun, while now their few remaining descendants are straggling vagabonds, having nowhere to lay their heads; and unless something is done by the Government to rescue them from the clutches of disease and poverty before "many moons" the last of the race will fall to sleep in the arms of the Great Spirit, whose still sweet voice whispered peace to their wigwams ere the orthodox cross of greed was planted upon their native shore. They grew to be a mighty race, prospering and increasing until the paleface serpents began to creep into their Eden. Upon these credulous people the white man perpetrated one act of fraud after another until finally they were forced to surrender their magnificent estate, inherited from their ancestors, for a promise of a paltry inheritance beyond the Mississippi. They were once rich, but now poor; once happy, now distressed. Once the eloquence of their orators mingled with the music of the rippling waters; now the coming shadows of racial death have silenced their ringing war whoop into the silent murmurings known only to the hopeless and helpless.

The roar of the locomotive has forever supplanted the screams of the wild panther, and the rattling plowshare has frightened the bounding deer from the forest. Smiling fields of husbandry now mark the Meccas of the red man, where he once romped and danced and wooed and died; where his dusky children gamboled with the wild flowers and the clinging vines, and where his dead are silently awaiting a resurrection into the happy hunting grounds beyond the grave. All that he loved and cherished have passed and gone. He moves, acts, and suffers like the shorn lamb before the untempered winds. [Applause.]

The loyalty of the Choctaw to the white man has been as unchangeable as the magnet. His gratitude has only been exceeded by our ingratitude. In war, in pestilence, and in peace he has been our foremost friend, and yet when he now comes,

like Lazarus to the gate of Dives, begging for bread, we hand him a serpent.

Notwithstanding he has been more thoroughly robbed and more cruelly treated by the white man than any other tribe of the American Indian, yet he has always been his friend. Claiborne, the historian, says:

The Choctaw orator always proudly boasted that their nation had never shed the blood of a white man.

As early as 1720 we find as many as 700 Choctaw warriors, under the leadership of their great mingo, or chief, marching to the rescue of the French settlers along the lower Mississippi Valley, who were being butchered by the bloodthirsty Natchez, the sun worshippers. A century after this, when the English and Spanish, by the aid of the great Shawnee chief, Tecumseh, had incited the Creeks to go to war with the white settlers of Alabama, they, instead of taking sides with their racial neighbors, enlisted under the Stars and Stripes and fought side by side with Jackson and Claiborne until the end of that bloody war, and their bones are to-day bleaching with those of our own soldier dead at Horseshoe Bend, Fort Mims, and other battlefields along the Alabama and the Coosa. When the news spread over the Southwest that the British had landed a hostile force at New Orleans they flocked by hundreds to assist General Jackson in expelling the foreign foe, and in the great battle that followed none fought more bravely than the Choctaw warriors.

In 1811, when Tecumseh went upon his daring mission to the South to organize a great war confederacy against the white settlers, he met the chiefs of the Choctaws and pleaded with them for many days and with much eloquence to join him. It is said by the historian that many of the young men were deeply agitated by the matchless eloquence of this northern warrior, but all of his influence was destroyed, and he was sent away in despair by the eloquent reply made to his speech by the Choctaw chief, Pushmattaha, who, in part, said:

You are now on your way, Tecumseh, to visit the Muskogees and to court an alliance with them. In three days you will enter their villages and eat out of their bowls. They abhor the white man and will listen to your talk, and when they hear your war whoop they will be ready to strike. But the Choctaws and Muskogees can never travel on the warpath together. Our old men and our traditions forbid it. The ghosts of our fathers would meet us and drive us back to our hunting grounds. The bones of our warriors, slain by Muskogees, are moldering near by, unavenged, and last night I heard their complaints around my camp. Even now I hear the voices of the dead in the passing breeze and I see their spirits in yonder cloud. They hold the pipe of peace to the white man and the tomahawk to the Muskogee.

This renowned chief was a great admirer of General Jackson, recognizing in his rugged honesty and intrepid bravery virtues he believed the Great Spirit imparted to but few save the Choctaw warriors. After having followed Jackson through all of the bloody wars of the Southwest, and after the latter became President, he visited this capital in order that he might once more behold his great white friend, and also to meet General Lafayette, whom he greatly admired and who was then on his last visit to America. While here he became suddenly ill and in a few days died. Being visited on his deathbed by General Jackson, he was asked if he had any request to make, and the dying warrior said: "When I am dead fire the big guns over me." These were his last words, which to-day may be read upon the faded marble slab in the Congressional Cemetery, hard by this Capitol. The historian, in recording this visit, says:

In 1824, with a delegation of his people, he visited Washington. Lafayette was then the guest of the Republic. The Choctaws waited upon him, and Pushmattaha delivered an address rarely surpassed in pathos and grandeur. The venerable Frenchman and all who heard it were deeply impressed.

This was his last speech. The voice of his Father was then calling him to the spirit land. His parting words to Lafayette were: "We heard of you in our distant villages. We longed to see you. We have come. We have taken you by the hand. For the last time we look on the face of the great warrior whose fathers were the friends of our fathers. We go. 'Tis the last time we shall meet. We shall both soon be in the land of shadows."

Of course, Mr. Chairman, this is all foreign to the question raised by my amendment. I refer to it only for the purpose of impressing this House with the kindly feelings with which the Choctaw always regarded the white man, and in order that we may more keenly appreciate the baseness of our ingratitude in permitting the remaining few of these unfortunate people to suffer in this land of plenty.

President Jackson, whom these untutored people idolized, in order to induce them to surrender the soil of Mississippi for an estate in the Territory used all the chicanery of statecraft, promising them that if they would surrender their Mississippi homes in exchange for a home in the West that the latter

should be theirs "as long as the grass grows and the water flows." Again he said to them through his agents:

There your Great Father will protect you and there, undisturbed and uninterrupted by the whites, you can enjoy yourselves and be happy. For you we have the best feelings; our complexions are different, but our hearts and our natures are the same; the Great Spirit above is our common father.

Being no longer able to resist the seductive persuasions of the great President, on the 27th of September, 1830, the Choctaws surrendered the lands of their fathers, broad and rich as they were, for this promised home in the West, which was to be theirs and their descendants in fee simple. Here permit me to insert in the RECORD the deed made by President Jackson, conveying to them their Territorial estates in pursuance of the said treaty:

Whereas on the 27th day of September last a treaty was concluded at Dancing Rabbit Creek between Commissioners duly appointed on the part of the United States and the Choctaw Nation of Indians; and the same, having been ratified by the Senate, was officially promulgated on the 24th of February, 1831, which treaty, in the second article, stipulates "that the United States, under a grant specially to be made by the President, shall cause to be conveyed to the Choctaw Nation a tract of country west of the Mississippi River, in fee simple to them and their descendants, to inure to them while they shall exist as a nation and live on it, beginning near Fort Smith, where the Arkansas boundary crosses the Arkansas River, running thence to the source of the Canadian fork, if in the limits of the United States, or to those limits; thence due south to Red River and down Red River to the west boundary of the Territory of Arkansas; thence north along that line to the beginning."

Now, in pursuance of said treaty, and of the powers and authority vested in me by an act of Congress approved the 28th day of May, 1830, entitled "An act to provide for an exchange of lands with the Indians residing in any of the States or Territories and for their removal west of the Mississippi River," said country as is described in the second article of said treaty is hereby granted and assigned to said Choctaw Nation of Indians to the extent and after the condition of tenure therein declared, and liable to no transfer or alienation except to the United States.

In testimony hereof, and that the same may be carried into effect, I have signed this grant with my own hand, and cause it to be certified under the seal of the War Department, this 26th day of May, 1831, and of the State Department.

ANDREW JACKSON.

By the President:

E. LIVINGSTON, *Secretary of State*.

By the President of the United States:

JOHN H. EATON, *Secretary of War*.

For a complete and perfect statement of all the transactions between the Government and the Choctaws, I refer the House to a very extended and able brief inserted in the RECORD of February 11 by my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. STEPHENS].

After this transaction the Government transported thousands of these Choctaws to their new home in the West. Many remained and still remain; many died from the rigor of the hard climate, and many, after the loss of their relatives, returned to their native haunts in Mississippi, where three or four hundred of their descendants now remain in a most deplorable and destitute condition.

Just here it must be remembered that under another article of the treaty referred to those who so desired were permitted to remain, and it was expressly stipulated that by so doing they did not forfeit their rights as tenants in common in the Territorial domain, but the only thing they would forfeit would be the right to share in the annuity of \$20,000 promised by the Government to be paid annually for twenty years. Hence it must be seen that the Mississippi Choctaw still owns an undivided interest in the Choctaw division of the Territory.

This treaty could never have been consummated except for the fourteenth article thereof, which provided that any Choctaw desiring to remain in Mississippi should have allotted to him by officers of the General Government a section of land including the land upon which his home was situated; but the avowed purpose of the Government being to remove him west of the Mississippi undertook to abrogate this provision, and by all kinds of subterfuges rendered it almost impossible for him to receive his allotment. Mr. Claiborne, in his "History of Mississippi," on this point says:

The operation of the fourteenth article (which had accomplished the treaty) was deceptive and destructive. Many who had left the ground were ignorant of their rights and were not informed in time to make the required application to the agent. Many who knew the provisions of the fourteenth article would not apply because they distrusted the white man, nor could they comprehend that there was any power on earth who had the power to dispossess them of the land whereon they were born and which they occupied and cultivated. The agent resided at a long distance from many of them, and the old and infirm could not present themselves. Many who went found the agent intoxicated, in an ill humor, were long delayed waiting for him to become sober, and finally he peremptorily refused to register them, and they returned, starving, penniless, despairing, to find their country swarming with speculators, who readily persuaded them to part with their rights and wander away.

This outrageous method of robbing these defenseless people continued until the Mississippi legislature, on the 25th day of

February, 1837, passed resolutions calling upon Governor Lynch to intercede with the Federal Government in their behalf. Thereupon President Tyler sent a commission to further urge them to remove to their home west of the Mississippi. As a member of this commission was the Hon. William Tyler, the brother of the President. They met the chiefs of the Choctaws, and again, by persuasive and deceptive arguments urged those who still remained under the provision of the said fourteenth article of the treaty to immediately consent to removal to the West. To this unreasonable request the Choctaws seriously protested, claiming their rights to remain under the treaty. And here let me insert the eloquent and pathetic speech of their great chief protesting against the infidelity of their great White Father in making this unjust demand:

Brother, we have heard you talk as from the lips of our Father, the great White Chief at Washington, and my people have called on me to speak to you. The red man has no books, and when he wishes to make known his views, like his fathers before him, he speaks it from his mouth. *He is afraid of writing.* When he speaks, he knows what he says; the Great Spirit hears him. *Writing is the invention of the palefaces; it gives birth to error and to fraud.* The Great Spirit talks; we hear him in the thunder, in the rushing winds and the mighty waters, but he never writes.

Brother, when you were young we were strong; we fought by your side; but our arms are now broken. You have grown large. My people have become small.

Brother, my voice is weak; you can scarcely hear me; it is not the shout of the warrior, but the wail of the infant. I have lost it in mourning over the misfortunes of my people. These are their graves, and in those aged pines you hear the ghosts of the departed. Their ashes are here, and we have been left to protect them. Our warriors are nearly all gone to the far country west, but here are our dead. Shall we go too and give their bones to the wolves?

Brother, two sleeps have passed since we heard you talk. We have thought upon it. You ask us to leave our country and tell us it is our Father's wish. We would not desire to displease our Father. We respect him and you, his child; but the Choctaw always thinks. We want time to answer.

Brother, our hearts are full. Twelve winters ago our chiefs sold our country. Every warrior that you see here was opposed to the treaty. If the dead could have been counted it would never have been made; but, alas, though they stood around, they could not be seen nor heard. Their tears came in the raindrops and their voices in the wailing wind, but the palefaces knew it not, and our land was taken away.

Brother, we do not now complain. The Choctaw suffers; but he never weeps. You have the strong arm, and we can not resist; but the paleface worships the Great Spirit. So does the red man. The Great Spirit loves truth. When you took our country you promised us land. There is your promise in the book. Twelve times have the trees dropped their leaves, and yet we have received no land. Our houses have been taken from us. The white man's plow turns up the bones of our fathers. We dare not kindle our fires, and yet you said that we might remain and you would give us land.

Brother, is this truth? But we believe now that our Great Father knows our condition. He will listen to us. We are as mourning orphans in our country, but our Father will take us by the hand. When he fulfills his promise, we will answer his call. He means well. We know it, but we can not think now. Grief has made children of us. When our business is settled, we shall be men again and talk to our Great Father about what he has proposed.

Brother, you stand in the moccasins of a great chief. You speak the word of a mighty nation, and your talk was long. My people are small. Their shadow scarcely reaches your knee. They are scattered and gone. When I shout, I hear my voice in the depth of the wood, but no answering shout comes back. My words therefore are few. I have nothing more to say but to tell what I have said to the tall chief of the palefaces, whose brother stands by your side.

This proceeding is but an index to the infidelity of the Government in dealing with the Choctaw. The first act was to rob them of their heritage in Mississippi and the last to bar them from the Territory.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. May I make a suggestion?

Mr. BYRD. Certainly.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Are not the Choctaw now entitled to a great deal of land in the Indian Territory?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; but how can they get it? It belongs to their tribe, but they have been outlawed by a ruling of the Department or act of Congress.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Why should not Congress see that these Indians get their rights now?

Mr. BYRD. That is what I say, too. Why does not the gentleman see to it; he is on the committee?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I have numerous bills pending and have been fighting for years along the line of which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. BYRD. The Department says they have lost their rights to take up lands in the Territory.

Not 5 per cent of those entitled under the treaty to take allotments in Mississippi were ever permitted to do so. To prevent them, trickery, deception, and even force were resorted to. In proof of this, consult the history of the transaction.

The next scene in the drama of the Choctaw robbery was a few years ago, when the Government undertook to divide in severalty their common estate in the Territory. As soon as the Curtis bill passed the land thieves, from Portland to Brownsville, swooped down like so many vultures upon these defenseless people, and the manner in which they have been

looted and robbed makes the darkest page of our legislative and administrative history.

This whole scheme was launched for the avowed purpose of outlawing the Mississippi Choctaw. The first edict issued was that none but those residing in the Territory at that time could share in the distribution of the lands, but this was abandoned. Then it was contended that only those who could trace their ancestry back to a certain class who participated in the treaty could receive a share, and this too was abandoned; and next it was insisted that only the descendants of the full bloods could inherit, and this likewise was overruled.

Being forced to admit that the Choctaw territory belonged to the tribe in common, regardless of where they lived or who their ancestors were, or whether half blood or whole blood, it was decided that the only way to outlaw the Mississippi Choctaws was to railroad a law through Congress requiring them to immediately remove to the Territory and live upon their several allotments, and that unless this was done within six months they were forever barred. Under this unlawful, unjust, and cruel law they have lost all. The book of fate seems to be forever closed against them. It was the "unkindest cut of all."

Why, Mr. Chairman, this procedure was nothing less than legalized robbery. Upon what process of reasoning can we justify either the justice or the legality of such action? Can the Government after executing a fee-simple title to this estate afterwards destroy the title by entailing an impossible condition upon it? Certainly not. There is not a lawyer who ever read three pages of Blackstone who will disagree with me on this proposition. But, whether the law be or be not constitutional, the Mississippi Choctaws are bound by it just the same, for the reason that the Government is cloistered behind that relic of kingcraft, that the sovereign can do no wrong, nor be sued, except by consent. Bills are pending before the Committee on Indian Affairs providing that these poor people be given access to the courts to ascertain their rights, but not one of them will be reported, for to do so would mean the defeat of the well-planned scheme of robbery.

Then, too, how unreasonable was the proposition to require these poor people to remove to the Territory within the short period of six months. They were without means, ignorant, and helpless. But it is contended that the Government made an appropriation of \$20,000 to move them. This might have sufficed to take some of them, but the whole amount was expended, and yet over 350 remained in Mississippi.

But admitting that they could have provided means for transportation, how were they to live on the blizzard-swept prairie, without houses, without food, clothing, or the implements of husbandry? Why, sir, a decree requiring the public school children of this city to go and provide homes for themselves on the frozen plains of Manitoba would not have been more cruel and unreasonable. Many of those who did go died from exposure. In many instances they were crowded during a long, cold winter into cotton sheds, barns, and warehouses. Disease broke out among them, and in some instances whole families perished.

Let it never be forgotten that this Government, since 1831, has been the self-constituted guardian of the Choctaws. Without invitation, we assumed the right to administer this sacred trust. Have we kept faith with our wards? Let their destitution and the deeds of robbery perpetrated upon them answer. Were we discharging our duty with all fidelity to them when we leased their valuable oil and coal lands to corporations for a mere trifle, or when we paid one law firm a little less than one million dollars out of their common fund in order to assist us in robbing them? Three hundred and fifty shares of that great sum was the lawful property of the Mississippi Choctaws and should have gone to them instead of to attorneys especially employed to defraud them. I don't say that these lawyers did not earn their fee. They won the case. With the aid of a few Government officials they succeeded in robbing my Choctaw friends of an interest in an empire. I dare say that no Roman general ever more thoroughly looted or pillaged a conquered nation than did these officers and attorneys these unfortunate people.

But I understand that there are yet 3,000,000 acres of this common estate and about \$400,000 unappropriated and unstolen. Now, in the name of reason and common justice, why not repeal this cruel statute, and let these Mississippi Choctaws yet share in this common estate? If you are not willing to do this, then open the doors of the courts and let them sue for their property, and if you are blinded to this just demand, let me implore you to provide for their support by a direct appropriation from the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, as a parting request for these ill-fated people, let me importune this House to never again require them to

move to the West. They prefer to starve about the graves of their ancestors rather than face the horrors incident to poverty in a strange, friendless land. If you ever permit them to reclaim their interests in the Territory, then, as their guardians, dispose of it and apply the proceeds to their support, and, above all things, shield them from that army of sharks who are ever ready to intercept every morsel offered them by the Government. [Applause.]

An infinitesimal part of the \$600,000,000 spent on the savage negroes of the Philippines, if given to the Mississippi Choctaws, would have been like manna from heaven to them. Do not conclude, should you desire to provide for them, that they would become a burden to the Government. They are gradually passing away, falling like autumn leaves, the victims of dreadful diseases, produced by exposure and poverty, and before many decades shall have passed the last of this once happy race will fall to sleep in the arms of the Great Spirit, whose bidding voice he now hears in the sighing winds and rippling waters.

The wild deer and wolf to a covert can flee,
But I have no refuge from famine and danger;
A home and a country remain not to me.
Never again in the green, sunny bowers
Where my forefathers lived shall I spend the sweet hours.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] is recognized.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, in presenting my remarks in connection with the bill now under discussion I desire to submit to the Committee of the Whole House that the subcommittee in the hearings, as well as the general committee in charge of the bill, were very greatly impressed and influenced by the statements of the chairman of the general committee [Mr. TAWNEY] in opening his remarks upon the urgent deficiency bill in this language:

I feel that it is my duty in presenting this first appropriation bill of the session, to call attention to the necessity for a practical revision of the estimated ordinary expenses of the Government for which appropriations are asked for the next fiscal year, to the end that these authorized expenditures may be kept within the estimated revenues for that year.

In connection with these remarks he quoted from the Secretary of the Treasury to this effect:

The last annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury gives us his estimates of the revenues for the next fiscal year. * * * It is only fair to say that this estimate was made before the recent financial depression, and in submitting the estimates in his annual report the Secretary says, "It is estimated that upon the basis of existing laws the revenues of the Government for the fiscal year 1909 will be \$878,123,030."

The Secretary also says:

The above estimates are submitted in pursuance of law. I regret the necessity of submitting them, for they are for the most part problematical.

But Chairman TAWNEY, in closing his detailed statement, adds this:

Total estimated appropriations, \$912,949,288.96, showing an excess of the estimate of appropriations submitted by the several Departments over the estimated revenues of the Government for the fiscal year 1909 of \$34,826,277.66.

The chairman [Mr. TAWNEY], in closing his remarks, emphasized his opening statement, as follows:

All new authorizations only emphasize what I said at the beginning, that it is absolutely necessary for us to practically revise the estimates in making up the several appropriation bills if we are to avoid facing a certain deficiency at the end of the first session of this Congress.

I desire simply to emphasize what he has said and to say, in going through this appropriation bill, which directly maintains more largely than any other the great subordinate force of the Government, that we have been constrained wherever it has been possible, without in any wise, as we think, affecting a fair conduct of each of the Departments of the Government, in cutting down the estimates submitted in the Book of Estimates. The Members of the House will have full access to our report, which covers every detail of change in the bill, which we will have under the five-minute rule and intelligently understand. I will read from the report:

The estimates on which the bill is based will be found on pages 9-115 and 156-170 of the Book of Estimates for 1909, and aggregate \$34,210,716.13, of which amount there is recommended in the bill \$32,336,573, a reduction of \$1,874,143.13 under said estimates.

The appropriations for the same purposes for the current fiscal year, including \$370,950 in the sundry civil and deficiency acts of the last session, aggregated \$32,406,493.80, being \$69,920.80 more than is recommended in the accompanying bill for the service of the fiscal year 1909.

The whole number of salaries specifically provided for in this bill is 14,818, or 341 less than the number estimated for, and 27 more than the number provided for in the law for the current year.

In addition I submit in detail the increases in the salaries asked for, 1,239, amounting to \$451,000, an average increase of \$367.

Increase of compensation asked for.

	Num-ber.	Amount.
Library of Congress	24	\$4,500
Court of Claims	3	300
Executive	8	8,180
Civil Service Commission	11	5,320
Department of State	8	2,900
Treasury Department	123	13,282
Independent Treasury	185	83,210
War Department	61	15,678
Navy Department	129	30,040
Interior Department	611	268,840
Post-Office Department	40	18,870
Commerce and Labor	19	7,190
Department of Justice	14	12,150
Judicial	3	1,200
Total	1,239	451,780

Average increase of \$367.

The only salaries distinctively raised in this bill are the First Assistant Secretary of State, who in the absence of the Secretary performs the duties and obligations of the Secretary, from \$4,500 to \$6,000, an increase of \$1,500; the second secretary from \$4,500 to \$5,000. In the Treasury Department all are increased from \$4,500 to \$6,000, because they can all be authorized to exercise the authority of the absent Secretary. In the War Department, the one secretary only, from \$4,500 to \$6,000. In the Navy Department, the one secretary only, from \$4,500 to \$6,000. The Interior Department, the first secretary from \$4,500 to \$6,000, and the second secretary from \$4,500 to \$5,000. In the Post-Office Department, the first secretary, who now receives \$5,000 to \$6,000, and from \$4,500 to \$5,000 the three remaining secretaries. The Department of Commerce and Labor, having one, \$5,000 to \$6,000, aggregating \$15,500.

Of the other salaries, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury from \$4,500 to \$5,500. For 53 first assistant examiners of the Patent Office from \$1,800 to \$2,000, 63 second assistant examiners from \$1,600 to \$1,800, 73 third assistant examiners from \$1,400 to \$1,600, and 83 fourth assistant examiners from \$1,200 to \$1,400. One Commissioner of Education from \$3,500 to \$5,000; one superintendent of dead letter division from \$2,500 to \$3,000; aggregating \$57,400.

I do not desire at this time to enter upon the details of the bill, because ample time will be provided later if the debate shall make explanations necessary. I invite the attention of the committee to the fact that in submitting the limitations upon the appropriations we have made, practically only nine, and while it may be they are subject to the point of order your committee have felt that they were necessary for the proper conduct of the Departments in connection with the appropriations that are carried in his bill.

LIMITATIONS.

Limitations with respect to the appropriations made in the bill and not heretofore imposed are recommended as follows:

On page 11:

The salary of each of the Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands shall be the same as that of the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico.

On page 63, in connection with the appropriation for expenses of collecting internal revenue:

That no part of this amount be used in defraying the expenses of any officer, designated above, subpoenaed by the United States courts to attend any trial before a United States court or preliminary examination before any United States commissioner, which expenses shall be paid from the appropriation for "Fees of witnesses, United States courts."

On page 95:

The superintendent of the State, War and Navy building shall also act as superintendent of the Navy Department Annex, or Mills Building, and the State Department Annex building.

On page 130 in connection with the appropriations for offices of surveyors-general:

That no expenses chargeable to the foregoing appropriations for clerk hire and incidental expenses, in the offices of the surveyors-general shall be incurred by the respective surveyors-general in the conduct of said offices, except upon previous specific authorization by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

On page 144:

That all persons employed on June 30, 1908, under the appropriations "Defending suits in claims against the United States," "Prosecution of crimes," "Punishing violations of the intercourse acts and frauds," and "Care of rented buildings, Department of Justice," may be, in the discretion of the Attorney-General, transferred to the places provided for them under the appropriation "Salaries, Department of Justice, 1909," without reference to the act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883, and without reference to the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.

On page 166, it is proposed to reenact Sec. 3, of the last legislative, etc., act, as a limitation on the sums appropriated by the accompanying bill, to read as follows:

Sec. 3. The appropriations herein made for the officers, clerks, and persons employed in the public service shall not be available for the compensation of any persons incapacitated for performing the service for which such person has been employed, and the heads of Departments shall cause this provision to be enforced, either by the demotion or removal of such person from the public service.

On page 166:

Sec. 4. It shall be the duty of the head of each Executive Department and other Government establishment at Washington to submit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a statement showing in detail what officers or employees (other than special agents, inspectors, or employees who in the discharge of their regular duties are required to constantly travel) of such Executive Department or other Government establishment have traveled on official business from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia during the preceding fiscal year, giving in each case the full title of the official or employee, the destination or destinations of such travel, the business or work on account of which the same was made, and the total expense to the United States charged in each case.

On page 167:

Sec. 5. No person now or hereafter employed in the classified service of any Executive Department shall be transferred from one Executive Department to, or be otherwise employed in, another Executive Department until such person shall have served continuously not less than three years in the Department from which he seeks transfer or in some other Department as an employee in the classified service.

On page 167:

Sec. 6. In the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, persons employed June 30, 1908, as additional members of the Board of Pension Appeals may be transferred and appointed to places in the classified service of the Department of the Interior without reference to the "Act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States" approved January 16, 1883.

I will reserve the remainder of my time. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the committee, last Monday morning a meeting of the banking and insurance interests of the city of Hartford was held in the board of trade rooms at 11 o'clock in the morning, the busiest hour of the day, on the subject of currency legislation. It is not necessary for me to speak a word of praise of those institutions in the city of Hartford. Its insurance interests are great, because of the great men who conservatively and successfully manage them. Its banking interests are necessarily great also. I want to send to the Clerk's desk and have read in my time a very brief portion of an editorial from the Hartford Courant describing the character of meeting and also the resolutions which the meeting adopted. In doing it I wish to say that these gentlemen were careful to give full and complete notice for a week of the character of the meeting and to send to Washington to the various Representatives from Connecticut to procure all the bills pending before Congress. I ask that the editorial and resolutions be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

[The Hartford Courant, Tuesday morning, February 11, 1908.]

THE VOICE OF HARTFORD.

That was an altogether representative gathering of Hartford business men at the board of trade rooms yesterday morning. Leading representatives of almost every bank, trust company, savings bank, life insurance company, and fire insurance company of the city were present. It would be useless to add all their assets together and say how much the meeting represented; but unquestionably it was hundreds of millions of dollars, not belonging to those who were there but in their hands for safe-keeping—entrusted to them by thousands and thousands of people all over the country. Their sole interest is to have the business of the United States conducted on a sound and healthy basis.

All present were of one mind. There were differences of opinion, to be sure, with regard to individual banking bills, but no difference at all on the larger proposition that no bill whatever should pass at the present time. The resolutions, carefully drawn by Vice-President P. H. Woodward, of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Company, speak for themselves. They protest against any enactment at the present time, and call for the appointment of a capable commission to consider the whole subject and report later to Congress:

"Whereas the acute stage of the panic of 1907 is past and the currency then withdrawn from circulation and hoarded is now returning to its accustomed channels; thus for deficiency substituting a redundancy of bankable funds; and

"Whereas steadiness of value in our common measure of value is a factor of prime importance:

"Therefore this body is opposed to the various schemes of inflation now before Congress under the general name of emergency measures, and recommends that if action is deemed necessary at this time it be confined to the creation of a competent commission empowered to investigate the whole subject and report hereafter."

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. That is all I desire—to present the resolutions—and I yield back the time that has been kindly conceded me by the chairman of the committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WASHBURN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 12398. An act to authorize the War Department to transfer to the State of Kansas certain land now a part of the Fort Riley Military Reservation; and

H. R. 2756. An act for the relief of L. K. Scott.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4740. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows of such soldiers and sailors;

S. 4734. An act to provide for the transfer of a certain fund from "depredations upon public lands" to the credit of White Earth bands of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota;

S. 4639. An act to provide for participation by the United States in an international exposition to be held at Tokyo, Japan, in 1912;

S. 4548. An act to provide for the sale of timber on allotted Indian land, and for other purposes;

S. 4455. An act to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in the State of Tennessee;

S. 4103. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the amount due O bah baum, and pay the same out of the fund known as "For the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians;"

S. 4066. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to increase the compensation of inspectors of customs;

S. 3941. An act to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to prevent unlawful occupancy of the public lands," approved February 25, 1885;

S. 3528. An act for the relief of Durham W. Stevens;

S. 3526. An act to amend section 876 of the Revised Statutes;

S. 3433. An act to establish on the coast of the Pacific States a station for the investigation of problems connected with the marine-fishery interests of that region;

S. 3426. An act to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Oklahoma;

S. 3351. An act to establish a marine biological station on the Gulf coast of the State of Florida;

S. 2609. An act providing for the acceptance of a donation of certain land situated at the Palisades, in the State of New Jersey;

S. 2483. An act to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, California;

S. 2027. An act for the relief of Phillip Hague, administrator of the estate of Joseph Hague, deceased;

S. 1893. An act granting an honorable discharge to Peter Fleming;

S. 1690. An act for the relief of Thomas C. Chappell;

S. 1407. An act to extend the provisions of the existing bounty-land laws to the officers and enlisted men and the officers and men of the boat companies of the Florida Seminole Indian war;

S. 651. An act for the reimbursement of certain sums of money to certain enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts;

S. 439. An act granting to the State of Oregon certain lands to be used by it for the purpose of maintaining and operating thereon a fish hatchery;

S. 208. An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of the surplus lands after allotment; and

S. 60. An act for the relief of the Chicago, Peoria and St. Louis Railway Company of Illinois.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I shall not undertake to make a speech to-day, desiring only to make a statement about the proceedings in the Federal court in New York commonly known as the "tobacco trust case," and to insert some matter pertaining to the history of that case, particularly some pertinent evidence adduced in that case showing its corrupt practices, and I will now ask, Mr. Chairman, that I may extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Gentlemen of the committee, I am doing this because I know that if you will only take the pains to look through the data that I will place in the Record that you will wonder that the human mind can become so accomplished in perpetrating fraud and acts of deceit. I think it is doubtful if anybody has ever found so many ways to commit frauds and deceive in trade and commerce as the tobacco trust.

It is the most scientific, thorough, and perfect monopoly,

the world has ever seen, I think. It is really interesting to study its unique machinery or read of its stealthy, noiseless, and majestic performances, and, I dare say, every lawyer and every citizen of intelligence in the civilized world who is familiar with the action of this combine expresses profoundest astonishment that such a machine was even devised by man. I am unable to give all the facts. We hope to do so later, when they are officially published, but I am able to submit to-day and place in the RECORD some of the landmarks, and you can easily imagine the rest of the proof. This concern belts the world and is pillaging the rights of American citizens, farmers, dealers, manufacturers, and consumers, as well as those in foreign countries. It has fastened its fangs in the liberties of the masses and is successfully stripping them of their substance. It is not only a menace to commerce and trade and dangerous to American institutions, but indeed a professional corruptionist. These and similar concerns must be trimmed down, or sooner or later our people to a man will be in a state of monopolistic paralysis.

Last night I was reading in a New York tobacco journal a statement that the Porto Ricans are crying out against this monster, and I think it has reached its hands down into fair Cuba, and the statement is made that this has been the cause of a great deal of the troubles and the quarrels which have occurred among the Cuban people.

In the course of the hearings on the "free leaf tobacco bill" one witness testified on two different occasions that neither he nor his firm were connected with the tobacco trust; yet only a few weeks ago one of the officers of that concern called, under oath, the name of that party and of the firm that employs him, stating that the firm has been a member of the tobacco trust since 1903—before this witness testified—and it is now said (and I am glad to hear it) that this witness was kept in ignorance of his firm being in the trust. If this is true, think of the firm.

Now, there is another case where a member of a tobacco organization has appeared about Congress, fighting what is known as the "Tawney anticoupon bill." He has stated, so Mr. Campbell, president of this organization, recently said, that his firm was not a member of the tobacco trust. Yet it has developed in this suit that it is a member of that trust. And so the body of the evidence goes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before the gentleman yields the floor I should like to get from him, if I can do so, some information upon a matter that has come to my attention from a large number of my constituents. It has been charged that the tobacco that is being sold at retail throughout the country is, a large portion of it, adulterated; that there are a great variety of materials that go to make up that tobacco. I should like to know whether that is true?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Oh, yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Has anything been undertaken to correct that evil?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I spoke to Doctor Wiley about that some months ago, and he said, as I remember, that he had investigated it, but had not found anything poisonous in the sample examined.

The time of Mr. GAINES of Tennessee having expired, by unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, it was extended five minutes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I know what my friend has in mind, that this tobacco is a mixture, and a very small per cent of it is real tobacco; that it is made up of various ingredients, all of which they will not let the public know; molasses, sugar, pepper, licorice, and other things are mixed up with it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I understand that certain leaves are used instead of tobacco.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Oh, yes; there never has been such an infernal fraud and penetrating curse, as this trust is, perpetrated upon the human family since the devil started sin in this world. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is a broad enough statement. Now, inasmuch as the gentleman is so familiar with the entire subject of tobacco, I am sure he will agree with me that those who use tobacco ought to have good tobacco.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Any of it is bad enough, but what is used ought to be good tobacco.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Yes; that is true. One of the things that has appealed to me most is that the poor, honest, bright, upright, ambitious young boy, who is trying to get himself up in the world, trying to pull himself up "by his own boot straps," has no chance if he undertakes to go into the tobacco business, or scarcely any other business, because of these im-

mense and overshadowing monopolies that crush him and force him to sell out, worst of all, sell his manhood and independence, to these concerns and learn, from these wolves in sheep's clothing, how to perpetrate frauds upon the American Congress and American people, and that, too—

With smooth dissimulating,
Skilled to grace,
A devil's purpose
With an angel's face.

Mr. Chairman, one of the charges in this great lawsuit is that this trust is a monopoly in restraint of Federal commerce and trade. I will place in the RECORD a statement published in the New York Journal of Commerce of January 30 last going to show this is such a monopoly. It shows that in chewing tobacco that concern controls 80 per cent; smoking tobacco, 75 per cent; snuff, 95 per cent; cigars, 15 per cent; little cigars, 90 per cent; cigarettes, 80 per cent. The American Stogie Company, which is a branch house, made 92,000,000 stogies.

Gen. J. C. McReynolds, counsel for the Government in its suit against the tobacco trust, has brought out the fact at the taking of testimony in the case that the American Tobacco Company and its subsidiaries control the following percentage of the business in the various branches of the trade: Chewing tobacco, 80 per cent; smoking tobacco, 75 per cent; snuff, 95 per cent; cigars, 15 per cent; little cigars, 90 per cent, and cigarettes, 80 per cent. The American Stogie Company, which is a branch of the trust, made 92,000,000 stogies last year. President George H. Hummel is also authority for the statement that the company made a lot of cheap cigars which could not be classed as stogies.

I have some letters in response to mine a few days ago from Edwin P. Grosvenor, one of the associate counsel in this case, asking him to send me some extracts from the testimony, which he could not do, but he wrote:

141 BROADWAY, NEW YORK CITY, February 4, 1908.

Hon. JOHN W. GAINES,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of February 1, asking for excerpts from the evidence which has been taken in proceeding against the American Tobacco Company and others.

The evidence, as you may be aware, has been taken before a special master and has not as yet been formally reported to the court. We have therefore refrained from giving out copies, deeming that the best course to pursue until the evidence shall be formally made a part of the public records.

I hope you will appreciate the situation and recognize the pleasure which it would give me to comply with your request, if conditions were otherwise.

It is undoubtedly true that a number of tobacco manufacturing concerns, including the R. A. Patterson Tobacco Company, of Richmond, Va., the Nail & Williams Tobacco Company, of Louisville, Ky., and the Wells-Whitehead Tobacco Company, of North Carolina, were long secretly owned by the American Tobacco Company, while being advertised, held out to the public and generally represented as independent and free from such connection.

Yours, very truly,

EDWIN P. GROSVENOR.

NEW YORK, December 20, 1907.

Hon. JOHN WESLEY GAINES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GAINES: I thank you for the copies of the interesting and valuable report of Hon. E. W. SAUNDERS on the tobacco trade in its relation to taxation and Government monopolies. It is always a pleasure to hear from you and to know that your interest in our case continues.

I am sending you under this cover copies of the United States Tobacco Journal, a trade paper, which will give you some account of the evidence which has been brought out in the course of the trial. During a period of four weeks the Government has been putting in its evidence daily, adjourning yesterday for over the holidays. The evidence involves so much detail that it is not of special interest to the press, and this may account for the lack of fuller reports in the papers.

We have established very convincingly through the letters of the officers of the American Tobacco Company one of the principal charges in our petition, namely, that the American Tobacco Company has secretly operated a large number of corporations, ostensibly independent with the view of crushing out companies which are really independent and unconnected with the "trust."

In fact, the progress of the case has been most encouraging.

Again thanking you for your courtesy in sending these pamphlets, as well as for the valued copies of your speech of June 28, 1906, already acknowledged, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

EDWIN P. GROSVENOR.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Post-Office Department should take hold of this trust under its antifraud powers. The evidence clearly shows some of these independent firms belong to the trust, and also discloses that this trust conducts a part of its business by using "straw men" and "straw firms," and of course uses the mail in so doing. In addition to this, these so-called "independents," if not these "straws," advertise their goods thus: "Not made by the trust," or boost their firm by publishing "We are not in the trust," when in fact, these statements are untrue and misleading, to the detriment of trade and commerce and the people, and the mail is used in so doing.

I will add, in conclusion, that in its answer to the bill filed in this case, this monopoly admits practically the allegations, but denies the deductions it contains and claims its business is moral, conducted "on the square," and within the limits of the law. I thank the committee for its courtesies.

[Tobacco, New York, February 6, 1908.]

TRUST'S GUERRILLA WARFARE—DASTARDLY METHODS BY WHICH DUKE AND HIS ASSOCIATES HAVE ASSAILED COMPETITORS ABLY SET FORTH IN REPORT PREPARED BY HUGH CAMPBELL.

The following masterly arraignment of the vicious methods of the tobacco trust during the past four or five years was presented by Hugh Campbell at the recent annual meeting of the Independent Manufacturers' Association of the United States. Mr. Campbell, who was subsequently made president of the organization, presented a report as vice-president, which was substantially as follows:

This has unquestionably been the most eventful year in the history of the tobacco business since the formation of the American Tobacco Company in 1890, for during the year the Government has taken an active part in controlling the operations of the tobacco trust. At our meeting held in Philadelphia on December 12, 13, and 14, 1904, a committee was appointed to ask the attention of the Government to what we considered the unfair and illegal methods pursued by the American Tobacco Company in its determination to monopolize the tobacco business not only of this country, but of the world.

Your committee, as instructed, called upon the Attorney-General of the United States and were assured that our complaint would have due consideration. Soon thereafter Mr. Henry W. Taft, of New York, was appointed special attorney-general to investigate the business and methods of the American Tobacco Company and its allied companies, and in a very short time he had gathered facts enough to satisfy himself that the methods of the tobacco trust were contrary to law, and he then instituted the licorice suit. If you independent manufacturers will recall our position in the spring of 1905, you will remember that each and every one of us felt that the greatest menace hovering over our heads at that time was the control which the American Tobacco Company had acquired over the licorice business, for without licorice we could not continue our business, and licorice we could only get from tobacco trust owned or controlled concerns.

We had the price of licorice paste advanced from 6 cents to 10 cents per pound, and it was very evident that, if the licorice trust had the power and the right to make these advances, it could have gone on advancing to any figure it pleased, or it could have refused to sell us altogether. As a New York attorney in a recent tobacco case, with which we are all familiar, said: "It is my client's right to sell or not to sell, just as it chose, and it had the right to refuse to sell for any reason or for no reason at all."

It is therefore to my mind self-evident that had it not been for Mr. Taft's prompt, masterly, and unrelenting action against the licorice companies, many of us would ere this have been driven out of business for want of licorice. You know the result of that licorice trial; and while it may not give you your licorice without cost, it enables you now to get your supply at a price you can pay and still remain in business.

In the course of this licorice suit a most important decision was rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States, by which it became obligatory upon the defendants to furnish the Government with any records or papers which might be called for, and under this decision there was brought out in the licorice trial correspondence which astounded us, but which pales into insignificance before that brought out recently in New York in the equity suit.

After the licorice trial, Mr. Taft reluctantly retired from the tobacco trust prosecution. He had given nearly two years of indefatigable work to it, and by his efforts had insured us the right to live, and for all time we shall owe Mr. Taft a debt of gratitude for his devotion to this case and the preservation of our business.

PROSECUTOR TAFT'S WORTHY SUCCESSOR.

After Mr. Taft's retirement from the case, happily the Government found a worthy successor, and Hon. J. C. McReynolds was appointed to carry on the good work, and after careful investigation and much study he filed the bill in equity which is now pending, and which has already brought great relief to the tobacco business in this country, bringing to light many heretofore hidden mysteries, so that now we know why certain competitors were able to spend and squander money as if it was water in their efforts to get our business from us.

TOBACCO TRUST'S CHANGE FOR THE WORSE.

A few years ago it would have been inconceivable to suppose that any great corporation such as the American Tobacco Company would stoop to the miserable meannesses that have characterized its course against competitors from 1903 until Mr. McReynolds filed his bill in equity.

The Battle Axe fight, while fierce and relentless and successful in its object, was still conducted in the open by the American Tobacco Company on one hand, and the then great independent manufacturers, Liggett & Myers, Drummond, Lorillard, Sorg, Finzer, and Daniel Scotten, on the other, but the American Tobacco Company met these competitors in open combat, for it had not then learned the art of guerrilla warfare which it has waged against us since 1903.

REVOLT BEGAN IN CHICAGO.

In 1902 Chicago dealers became stirred up at the threatened invasion of their city by the United Cigar Stores Company, and formed, as you will remember, an association to fight for the preservation of their business.

A member of that association came to Richmond, Va., and at his request a few manufacturers there met him and listened to an enthusiastic address from him, and upon his suggestion a local independent tobacco manufacturers' association was then and there formed. Later it was determined to call a meeting of all the independent tobacco manufacturers in the United States, to be held in Washington, and accordingly we met in January, 1903, and formed this association.

Our first endeavor was to gain relief from Congress from the obnoxious practice that had grown into our business of giving coupons on the side, and through the action of the association the Otjen bill was successfully carried through the House of Representatives by a large majority, but was blocked in the United States Senate.

TOBACCO TRUST SPIES IN THE ORGANIZATION.

Our association was then enthusiastically in favor of that bill and the tobacco trust as determinedly opposed to it, but before another meeting of our association the tobacco trust had acquired ownership or control of quite a number of our members, and when we again met in Washington December 10 and 11, 1903, it was ably and numerously represented at our meeting.

In August of that year it had acquired a two-thirds interest in the R. A. Patterson Tobacco Company, of which the then president of our association was vice-president; it had a large interest in Nall & Williams, which was represented by Mr. Bow; it had a large interest in the company which John W. Brown represented; it owned the Bland

Tobacco Company, of Petersburg, which R. P. Hamilton represented; it owned Spencer Brothers, of Martinsville, which Mr. Spencer represented; it owned Lipfert, Scales & Co., which Mr. Lipfert represented; and, in addition to these secretly owned or controlled manufacturers, since our previous meeting it had openly bought the business of several others of our members, notably Butler & Boshier Co., of Richmond, and B. Leidersdorf & Co., of Milwaukee.

At that meeting it was charged that we had "wolves in sheep's clothing" in our midst, and therefore it was necessary that we should establish some qualification of membership, but with the cards stacked against us the proposition was of course voted down.

A year afterwards, at our Philadelphia meeting, this requirement was successfully carried, which marked the beginning of the end, for, like snow in summer, these secretly owned concerns disappeared from our membership.

ASSOCIATION PURGED OF TRAITORS.

While we may not since then have been numerically as strong as we were before, we have been able to speak out at our meetings freely and fully and frankly, and without fear of a traitor being by our side.

Since the summer of 1903 every one of us had to meet the relentless, vindictive, and vicious competition of these apparently independent but secretly owned and subsidized companies, posing before the trade of the United States as independents like ourselves, damning the tobacco trust and apparently fighting it, while secretly reporting to it every move we made.

DULA'S DASTARDLY INCITEMENTS TO TREACHERY.

The developments brought out by the Government suit against the tobacco trust are appalling, and one wonders at the exhibition of "man's inhumanity to man." During December some of the correspondence between two of the vice-presidents of the American Tobacco Company and these secretly owned concerns was unearthed, and from these letters it appears that, beginning in 1903, Nall & Williams were subsidized and paid 2 cents per pound on everything they sold by the American Tobacco Company, and all through the correspondence with Mr. Middleton and Mr. Bow Mr. Dula "suggested" to them how they could get the business away from certain independent manufacturers or prevent them from getting business in new territory.

He also "advised" them of new brands to get up for competition and what to do in regard to the corner in burley tobacco, which the tobacco trust engineered in 1904, and while he was carrying on this correspondence, directing his letters to Mr. Middleton's house, he was in regular correspondence with M. C. Patterson, president of the R. A. Patterson Tobacco Company, "advising" him what to do in the way of getting up new brands and going after the business of independent manufacturers after trying in vain to buy them up.

"PERCY" HILL'S HAND IN THE DIRTY WORK.

He was also doing the same thing with R. P. Hamilton, of the Bland Tobacco Company, Petersburg, and while Mr. Dula was following up these concerns, Percival S. Hill was directing the Queen City Tobacco Company in its onslaught upon the Day and Night Tobacco Company, of Cincinnati, and was also instructing Mr. Carter, of the Wells-Whitehead Tobacco Company, what to do in the independent cigarette business.

KNIFING INDEPENDENTS AT SHORT RANGE.

Each and every one of these apparently independent concerns were pushing their business throughout this country as independent tobacco manufacturers, using the union label and pretending to belong to our camp, and were therefore able to knife us at short range, and keep the jobbers and retailers of the country stirred up so that they did not know where they were at.

TRUST DETERMINED TO KILL COMPETITORS.

This correspondence, which has been read into the record of this suit in equity, is so surprising, revealing the determination on the part of the tobacco trust officials, where they could not buy off a competitor, to kill him off, that we wonder at the state of mind to which these men brought themselves, living and doing business in this free country, and the only explanation we can find of it is that they were so drunk with their success that they felt themselves superior to all law and immune from its enforcement, but, thank God, the Government still lives, and we have at its head a President who believes in fair play and is determined that you and I shall have the right to do business so long as it is decent, honest, and legitimate.

The most determined and vindictive onslaught against a competitor, as thus far developed by this trial, and as was previously well known to many of us, was that which the Queen City Tobacco Company, of Cincinnati, waged against the Day and Night Tobacco Company.

CONDOLING WITH POOR FRIEDLANDER.

From the day that company was formed it waged warfare, regardless of cost, helping the tobacco trust to run up the price of raw material while keeping down the price of the manufactured article, and, when cigar clippings had gone up from 7½ to 25 cents, changed its package from 2½ ounces for 5 cents to 3 ounces for 5 cents. Then Mr. Galbraith consorted with Mr. Friedlander and lamented the unprofitableness of business, and Friedlander, still thinking that Galbraith was independent, gave himself away, and, finding that he had to either sell or face ruin, surrendered.

TRUST BUSHWHACKERS IN AMBUSH.

It was my privilege during December to hear a good deal of the testimony taken in this Government suit against the American Tobacco Company and its allied companies, and to learn by that testimony of the machinations of the tobacco trust in open warfare and of its bushwhackers in ambush fighting us in the rear, and it is simply marvelous to me that we are here, still free and independent and in a position to carry on our business.

INDEPENDENTS' LONG, WEARY STRUGGLE.

It has been a long and weary fight from the summer of 1903 until the summer of 1907, which this association has conducted in order to get these secretly trust-owned "independent" manufacturers unmasked, but, happily, that is now being accomplished.

During the taking of testimony recently in the equity suit I was glad to hear, and I am sure you will be glad to know, that the former president of this association, John Landstreet, did not know of the secret ownership of the R. A. Patterson Tobacco Company until the spring of 1905, but to my mind this places the American Tobacco Company in a position all the more reprehensible because, while, according to Mr. Dula's testimony, Mr. Landstreet did not know of this secret ownership, the American Tobacco Company did know that Mr. Landstreet was president of our Independent Tobacco Manufacturers' Association, and

it allowed him to continue president of the association from August, 1903, until February, 1905, and there are no words in the English language sufficiently strong to stigmatize as they should the duplicity thus practiced.

LANDSTREET AND BOW CONTRASTED.

Some of you will recall Mr. Landstreet's scathing arraignment at our meeting in December, 1903, of anyone who could be so low, so demean himself, as to be present with us if the tobacco trust had any interest in the business he represented, and we believe that he was sincere in what he said, but we can not say as much for George Bow, representing Nail & Williams, as, while he was at that meeting hotly maintaining the independence of his company, he knew that it was not so, as he was then in regular communication with an officer of the American Tobacco Company.

HOPEFUL OUTLOOK FOR A SQUARE DEAL.

The trial of the suit in equity is still pending. It, therefore, would be impolitic, unwise, and useless to speculate as to its outcome, but already much relief has been accomplished, for which we have great cause of thankfulness, and we may rest assured that neither the tobacco trust nor any other trust will for all time be allowed to continue to do business in violation of law, and, whenever forced to conduct business according to law, we will have an opportunity of doing our business untrammelled, without fear or favor.

Sooner or later the jobbers and retailers of tobacco throughout the country will take courage and realize that the only safeguard they can establish for the perpetuation of their business lies in supporting independent tobacco manufacturers, their interests and ours being identical.

Every thinking tobacco dealer throughout the country knows full well the danger confronting his business, and still so many of them are so satisfied to live to-day that they bow the knee to the one great power in the tobacco business and steadily help it to kill off their own business.

ONLY SALVATION FOR DEALERS.

These jobbers and retailers of tobacco, if they would only allow the spirit of their forefathers to possess them, would, with American grit, fight for their inborn right to do their business in their own way, buying from whomsoever they please, and they would also appreciate the fact that, were it not for the continued existence of the stubborn few independent tobacco manufacturers, the jobbing and retailing of tobacco throughout the United States would soon be altogether in the hands of the tobacco trust and its retail stores, the United Cigar Stores Company, and, realizing this, they would push the sale of the goods which it is clearly to their best interest they should push, namely, those manufactured by really and truly independent tobacco manufacturers.

TRUST'S SIGNAL DEFEAT IN BAY STATE.

I had expected that the appeal of the American Tobacco Company in the Plymouth County case would have been argued in the Supreme Court of the United States by this time, but I am advised that the American Tobacco Company has abandoned that appeal, and now the decision of the supreme court of Massachusetts stands, and after fighting since 1900 the tobacco trust has thrown up its hands and admits that, in Massachusetts at least, it can not make it a condition of sale that the buyer shall not buy like goods from another.

LAW BORN OF TRUST INTOLERANCE.

Some of you will recall that in 1900 all goods of certain independent manufacturers were thrown out by jobbers in New England, and those jobbers were prohibited from buying any new brands of any independent manufacturers. The Massachusetts legislature passed a bill for the "protection of traders," prohibiting the tobacco trust from continuing its restrictions, and from the passage of that bill until 1904 we had free trade in New England.

Then, having secured control of so large a number of manufacturers doing business in that territory, evidently the tobacco trust thought that it could do as it would, and in January, 1904, you and I and every other independent manufacturer doing business in New England had our goods thrown out by 99 per cent of the jobbers in that territory.

GREAT VICTORY FOR INDEPENDENTS.

In May, 1904, Asa P. French, then district attorney of Plymouth County, at the instance of the attorney of this association, Paul R. Blackmur, summoned before his grand jury the jobbers of tobacco in this county, resulting in the indictment of the representative of the tobacco trust. In October, 1904, the case was tried and conviction secured. The tobacco trust appealed, and, on some technicalities, the appeal was sustained, and the case had to be tried over again, resulting in another conviction, which was amply sustained in a most able decision rendered by Judge Knowlton, of the supreme court of Massachusetts, and I congratulate this association upon the final result reached in that long-fought litigation.

TRUST MAGNATES SEE THEIR DANGER.

The farmers and mechanics of this country are fast opening their eyes to the might and power of the ballot box, and it is inconceivable that for any length of time a few trusts, dominated by a few men, are going to be allowed either to rule or ruin this country, for the American people will not be made serfs, and the sooner a few magnates of the country realize this the better for them. They had a little preliminary taste during the past few months, and so sure as they persist in their combination, monopolies, and disregard of the rights of others, so surely will a day of atonement be reached.

ANTITRUST LAWS IN MANY STATES.

Many of the States have passed acts prohibiting a railroad company from buying or acquiring any interest in a parallel or competing line, and this surely is sound policy viewed from the standpoint of the greatest good to the greatest number, and in these days of antitrust agitation it seems to me that the time has come for the National Government to exercise control over the large industrial corporations of the country, and that a law should be enacted making it illegal for any industrial corporation, which has 40 or 50 per cent of the business in the United States in the article which it manufactures or in which it trades, from buying up a competitor, and it should also be made illegal for a great corporation to sell goods at a less price in one part of the country than it does in another.

TRUST METHODS OF KILLING COMPETITION.

You and I have seen the tobacco trust give goods away for nothing, sometimes less than nothing in one locality, in order to accomplish its nefarious purpose of killing a competitor, or so demoralizing him that he would sell out.

If the business of the country is to be preserved for the people of the country, if young men are still to have the inspiration, encouragement, and hope their fathers had of one day being in business for themselves, then the growth by fair means or foul of these great trusts must be restrained.

If our legislators are wise they will now take time by the forelock and pass a law controlling combinations, and not delay until the people become desperate and wanton destruction and waste ensue. A fair index to what may be expected is now taking place in Kentucky.

INIQUITIES OF THE GIFT COUPON.

In January, 1903, this association took an active part in bringing to the attention of Congress the iniquities of the coupon system in connection with the tobacco business, coupons being placed in smoking tobacco and tags upon plug tobacco for redemption, so that when a man bought a package of smoking or a piece of plug tobacco he acquired a small to-be-divided interest in a needle or an anchor, a shot gun or an automobile.

A bill was introduced by Mr. Otjen and passed the House of Representatives, but was held up in the Senate. At the following session another bill was introduced, but by that time the tobacco trust had a grip upon the throat of our association, and as an association we did nothing in favor of the bill, and it was voted down in the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

TOBACCO TRUST FOOLED CONGRESS.

At the hearings before that committee the tobacco trust did not openly appear in person, but instead it had officers of apparently independent concerns, but which it owned, appear at the hearings before that Ways and Means Committee in opposition to the bill, one of the most active being R. P. Hamilton, of the Bland Tobacco Company, Petersburg, which company was at that time entirely owned by the American Tobacco Company, and yet he had the audacity to argue before that committee that his business would be greatly injured and that the act would be a great wrong to his independent concern.

BOW SNEEZED WHEN DUKE TOOK SNUFF.

George D. Bow, representing Nail & Williams, also came to Washington to work against the bill. The officers of the tobacco trust and others in authority at 111 Fifth avenue wrote to the officers of nearly all its secretly owned or controlled concerns to become active in opposition to this anticoupon bill, using their best efforts with their Congressmen against the measure, and so, with a great many apparently independent concerns protesting against the bill, the Ways and Means Committee was naturally led to suppose that the independent manufacturers were by no means united, whereas the fact developed that at that time there were only two really independent manufacturers in the United States, so far as we can ascertain, who were earnestly against that measure.

THE NEW TAWNEY ANTICOUPOON BILL.

Congressman TAWNEY has again agreed to introduce a bill to rid the country of this obnoxious practice, to stop giving something on the side, and I now recommend that we take up this anticoupon question and settle it once and for all time, and get it behind us.

I would also recommend to the association that it consider whether or not it is possible to bring the tobacco warehouses of Louisville and Cincinnati to realize that their present method of sampling tobacco is outrageously unjust, a large proportion of the samples drawn being utterly unlike the hogsheds from which they are taken, and at times the wonder is where the samples come from.

The association should also consider the free-leaf bill, which is again before Congress, and arrange to have its passage opposed, for should it become law it will surely injure the tobacco-manufacturing business and fall utterly to benefit the farmer.

[Tobacco, New York, January 30, 1908.]

TOBACCO TRUST OUGHT TO BE BROKEN.

Undoubtedly the tobacco trust has the farmers in a tight grip. When it comes to pass that there is virtually but one buyer for such a product as tobacco, it is time to do something besides assail trusts in our party platforms and on our campaign stumps. The power of such a monopoly ought to be broken.—Louisville Courier-Journal.

[Tobacco, New York, January 30, 1908.]

TOBACCO TRUST BREEDS ANARCHY.

The anarchy in the Kentucky tobacco counties, where night riders set fire to the tobacco warehouses of the tobacco trust and destroyed them, is the logical sequel to the methods of the tobacco trust, which has forced down the price of tobacco so that there is no profit in raising it. Tobacco which was worth \$15 was hammered down to \$3. There can be no defense of the lawlessness of the Kentucky tobacco growers. But what shall be said of the actions of the tobacco trust, which has exasperated these men and finally driven them into lawlessness? The American people will ultimately have to grapple with this trust. There are men in Paterson, like Bernard Feeney and others, whom it has driven out of a profitable business which took them years to build up. But they couldn't buck the tobacco trust and were forced out.—Paterson News.

[Norfolk Virginian-Pilot.]

BACKSTAIRS INTRIGUES OF TRUST—PROMINENT SOUTHERN NEWSPAPER'S COMMENT ON DISCLOSURES AT TRIAL NOW IN PROGRESS.

The tobacco trust does not appear to good advantage in some of the disclosures of its methods recently made by its own officers. The spectacle is not a nice one of business men of good repute secretly selling their factories to the combine, continuing to proclaim that their enterprises are independent of the trust, entering into the councils and partaking in the confidence of the independent association, and generally posing as disconnected from and inimical to the interest which really owns them body and soul. It is an unsavory development in whatever light regarded.

[Tobacco, New York, January 30, 1908.]

TOBACCO TRUST BREEDS CIVIL WAR.

The contest between the tobacco trust and the Tobacco Growers' Association in Kentucky has grown to the proportions of a civil war. The tobacco growers have organized bands of "night riders," which have destroyed about \$1,000,000 of property, killed several people, and terrorized the tobacco-growing regions of the State. Governor Willson states in his inaugural address that the tobacco trade of the State is paralyzed, and all other kinds of business affected; the price of land

has gone down and people are leaving the State. Vigorous measures are being taken to protect the property in the larger tobacco warehouse centers, but the farmers in the country are helpless and in terror of their lives. The cause of the trouble was the efforts of the tobacco trust to force down prices by driving all other buyers out of the market. Those who wished to buy tobacco were assigned a district in which alone they would be allowed to buy, and no other buyer was allowed to operate in that district. Competition was thus killed and the tobacco growers were obliged to take what they could get, and it was claimed that prices were forced below the cost of production. In desperation the growers formed an association in connection with the Farmers' League of America, and the association has forbidden any grower selling his crop below a certain price. The violence has been directed against the farmers who were obliged or ventured to sell their tobacco contrary to the demands of the association, and against the warehouses of the tobacco trust. The contest involves the same principles which enter into conflict between employers and labor unions over the question of the open shop. The tobacco growers were certainly in a hard plight and little sympathy can be felt for the tobacco trust.—The Watchman, organ of the Baptist denomination.

JAMES B. DUKE LOOKED WORRIED—TOBACCO TRUST HEAD WATCHES WELDING OF CHAIN OF EVIDENCE THAT MAY SEND HIM TO JAIL—SEEMED UNDER SEVERE NERVOUS STRAIN.

James B. Duke, the head of the tobacco trust, was an intent spectator this week in the United States circuit court room in New York and seemed to watch Special Attorney-General McReynolds with a sort of fascinated interest as the latter conducted the taking of evidence in the case of the United States Government against the tobacco trust.

Duke was plainly ill at ease and seemed to be laboring under severe nervous excitement. He fidgeted about constantly in his seat and frequently raised his hands to his face in an irritable manner. At other times he occupied himself by nervously tearing up scraps of paper.

The worn and weary look upon his face, which was noted when he appeared as a witness at the prosecution of some of his subordinates a little less than a year ago, has considerably intensified in the months that have since passed, although his face is somewhat more bloated than it was at that time. The hard, cynical lines about the mouth seem as prominent as ever, while the lines of worry around the eyes give the general impression of a man who regards life as a bad joke with which he is mightily wearied.

The taking of testimony before Commissioner Shields was begun last Thursday. As explained by Tobacco, Commissioner Shields merely acts as an examiner to preside over the taking of testimony and the filing of affidavits.

The usual formidable legal array put in an appearance to defend the tobacco trust, including Delancey Nicoll, W. W. Fuller, Junius B. Parker, Ex-Judge Wallace, William B. Hornblower, and S. M. Stroock. The Government was represented by Special Attorney-General McReynolds and Edwin P. Grosvenor.

W. R. Harris, vice-president of the American Tobacco Company and chairman of the board of directors of the British-American Tobacco Company, was the first witness called, as Tobacco foreshadowed last week.

Judge McReynolds then began his volley of questioning. Mr. Harris testified that he first became identified with the trust in May, 1890.

"What large concerns engaged in the manufacture of plug and smoking tobacco in 1890 are now engaged as independent concerns?" asked Judge McReynolds.

Harris was forced to admit that at the moment he could recall none. He tried to justify his admission by stating that the American Tobacco Company lost money on plug tobacco between the years of 1893 and 1898.

"What caused this loss?" was the next pertinent question Judge McReynolds put. "The company was pushing trade," Harris replied.

"In taking over other companies, did the American Company make the other concerns agree not to sell to druggists or small dealers?" Harris was forced to admit that in most cases such an agreement had been made.

Admissions were drawn from Harris showing that by foreign consolidations the tobacco trust at one time controlled the tobacco trade of the world, save in France, Italy, Turkey, and Austria-Hungary, where the tobacco trade is a Government monopoly. Mr. Harris went on to admit that when the trust first entered England as a competitor the control of the Ogden Company (Limited) was secured. The business was continued for a time under the old name, because of the fear that doing business under the American title might hamper it.

Later the witness said, after James B. Duke and Thomas F. Ryan had made many negotiations abroad, the control of the Imperial Tobacco Company, of Great Britain and Ireland, was secured, some two years after the Ogden Company, and the two formed the British-American Tobacco Company.

"Was the Imperial Tobacco Company at the time its control was secured a paying concern?" asked Judge McReynolds. "It was," replied Mr. Harris, but he declined to give further particulars.

The witness was forced to explain further that when control was being sought in Great Britain of the tobacco trade, \$1,000,000 was spent to meet competition, and that, in addition, all profits in Great Britain were turned back to the purchasers.

Judge McReynolds had already questioned Mr. Harris concerning the growth of tobacco, the proportions grown in America and other countries, and its manufacture in the United States into marketable products; thus, step by step, forcing out evidence of the growing monopoly fostered by the tobacco trust.

Frank H. Ray, one of the directors of the American Tobacco Company, was the next witness. He said that he was formerly connected with the Paul J. Sorg Company, plug tobacco manufacturers of Middletown, Ohio. He stated that the first consolidation was effected through the formation of the Continental Tobacco Company, afterwards merged with the American. Mr. Ray testified that there had been at one time considerable competition between the plug manufacturers. Mr. Ray then explained the absorption of the Sorg Company by the Continental and the negotiations between that company and the American Company.

T. B. Yulle, head of the leaf-buying department of the American Tobacco Company, was called by Judge McReynolds Monday and questioned at great length concerning the growth of leaf in the South, the numerous tobacco markets in the South, the different kinds of tobacco, and the proportion of the output the tobacco trust controlled.

W. K. Smith, a stockholder in several companies of the tobacco trust, was called and questioned concerning the state of affairs since the trust began its attempt to monopolize the tobacco trade.

Percival S. Hill, vice-president of the American Cigar Company and president of S. Anargyros, was on the stand Tuesday and Wednesday. The hearing is held in room 124, fourth floor of the Post-Office Building, and is open to the public.

TRUST SAILING UNDER FALSE COLORS—OPENS UNITED CIGAR STORE IN DES MOINES, IOWA, WHICH POSES AS AN ANTITRUST ESTABLISHMENT.
[Special to Tobacco.]

DES MOINES, November 25.

The tobacco trust recently entered into negotiations for opening one of its retail stores in Des Moines and caused the matter to be heralded in the local newspapers as the entrance of a big antitrust concern into Des Moines. The local newspapers also referred to the United Cigar Stores Company as has having been organized a few years ago to fight the tobacco trust.

The tobacco trust has often heralded its National Stands branch as organized to fight those who created it, but, so far as is known, this is the first time that the trust has ever brazenly proclaimed that the United Cigar Stores were created to fight the trust which actually owns and controls \$1,350,000 of the United Stores' \$1,650,000 capitalization, as well as \$2,850,000 of the United Stores' bonded indebtedness.

It is hardly likely that the intelligent people of Des Moines will swallow the story that the United Stores was organized to fight the tobacco trust, and it is difficult to understand just why the trust should attempt any such brazen deception at this time, when both the trust and its creature, the United Stores Company, are codefendants in the suit instituted by the United States Government and now on trial in New York.

HAWKEYE.

STARVATION PRICES FOR TOBACCO.

The present situation in the tobacco-growing districts has gained frequent reference in the editorial columns of the daily newspapers of the United States during the past few months, and almost invariably the able editors have uncorked the vials of their wrath upon the heads of the tobacco farmers, at least upon that portion of them who, driven to desperation by the wicked work of the tobacco trust, have sought to better their condition by joining the various organizations formed to cooperate in securing living prices for their leaf tobacco.

These tobacco farmers have been editorially characterized as anarchists, as incendiaries, as un-American, as a criminal horde, as barn burners, as midnight assassins, and a long list of foul epithets tending to hold them up to ignominy in the eyes of all good citizens.

For the moment it is unnecessary to speculate as to whether this abuse of the tobacco farmers was directly inspired by the tobacco trust, which has a crafty way of distributing fat advertising contracts to the daily newspapers at opportune times, or whether they have merely resulted from the attempts of the able editors to comment off-hand upon affairs concerning which they possess a most meager knowledge.

The city of Owensboro is in the heart of the tobacco-growing district of Kentucky. The Owensboro Messenger is an able and conservative newspaper. Its editor is a man of ripe judgment and keen perceptions who has lived in that section for years. Surely his opinion should outweigh the snap judgments of editors scores and hundreds of miles away, who are ready to condemn tobacco farmers upon scanty and often most untrustworthy statements regarding the conditions in that section.

The editor of the Owensboro Messenger in a recent editorial reviews the present situation. This editorial is remarkably temperate and almost judicial in its summing up of facts.

The prosperity of Owensboro, it says, is dependent upon the prosperity of the tobacco growers; tobacco is the great staple upon which the people of that section must exist; there are no other farming products which can take the place of tobacco in that community; the manufacturing interests are insufficient to support the people.

The editorial further says: "Whatever the mistakes of the farmers, however much they may have been duped by the secret agents of the tobacco trust, it is no time to scoff at them, or to withhold from them the helping hand."

"It is time for equal and exact justice. Three-cent tobacco—a starvation price—brought on this situation but a few years ago. The farmers have profited to some extent by pooling. They would have profited more if they had not split among themselves. The farmers have so far been entirely orderly in their conduct."

This is the testimony of an eyewitness, of a man who has been constantly upon the scene, and who has nothing extenuated, nor set down aught in malice. Is not his evidence to be preferred to the mere assertions of editors who know next to nothing of the real facts?

This man, keen of observation and conservative in statement, presents the damning evidence of the manner in which the tobacco farmers have been ground down beneath the iron heel of the tobacco trust. "Three-cent tobacco—a starvation price—brought on the present situation" in Kentucky.

And even in the face of such conditions there are editors who deprecate the present efforts of the United States to find a legal remedy for the pernicious activities of the tobacco trust. Had these editors lived in the days of Captain Kidd they would undoubtedly have derided the efforts of civilized nations to put a stop to piracy on the high seas.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

While representatives of the tobacco trust were recently negotiating for the lease of premises in Des Moines, Iowa, in which to install one of the trust's retail stores, the Des Moines newspapers came out with articles, which were all too evidently inspired by someone connected with the United Cigar Stores branch of the tobacco trust, stating in so many words that the former was organized for the express purpose of fighting the latter, and heralding the United Store to be opened in Des Moines as a great antitrust establishment.

Representatives of the tobacco trust have done many strange things in the past, but it is difficult to understand what they expect to gain by any such brazen, but in the long run, fruitless attempt to deceive the people of an up-to-date community like Des Moines.

The tobacco trust and the United Cigar Stores have so often and in so many different ways admitted their relationship with each other and the connection between the two is so plainly set forth in the bill of complaint filed against the two and numerous other codefendants in the suit of the United States Government that this attempt of the United Stores to sail under false colors at this late day seems inex-

plainable upon any reasonable hypothesis. Perhaps the deception was attempted as a joke by subordinates in the tobacco trust.

CASE LOOKS BAD FOR THE TRUST—MASS OF DAMAGING EVIDENCE BROUGHT OUT BY PROSECUTOR McREYNOLDS—HOW DUKE SCHEMED TO DEMORALIZE IMPORTED CIGAR BUSINESS.

The suit in equity of the United States Government against the tobacco trust and everybody concerned in it continues to go merrily on.

The investigation Tuesday was devoted exclusively to snuff and the branches of the tobacco trust that make it. Special Attorney-General McReynolds summoned George W. Helme, formerly of the George W. Helme Company, which was acquired by the American Snuff Company branch of the tobacco trust.

Judge McReynolds questioned the witnesses concerning the negotiations in high finance that resulted in the acquiring of the Helme Company by the trust; how the pro rata shares were distributed, and how the capital stock was apportioned. The Government counsel drew from the snuff man many damaging admissions tending to show a monopoly.

Mr. Helme could not tell of a single independent snuff company of any size, and excused himself by saying that he had been out of the snuff business for four years. He then was forced to disclose the various secret agreements whereby various subordinates agreed to effect certain combinations. Helme told also of the fact that the various names used for snuff were usually the firm name of the manufacturer, which was also a trade-mark.

Judge McReynolds requested the witness to name the various prominent snuff manufacturers and the name of the snuff they produced, whereupon Helme admitted that every company was controlled by the American Snuff Company.

The examination went into every detail concerning who owned the stock of the Helme Company and how it was transferred to the American Snuff Company and how the members of the Helme Company received stock of the reorganized company as a tobacco-trust concern. Helme claimed that every snuff company was run independently under its corporate name.

"You wish to convey the impression that each company has a distinct management, but they are all under the direction and control of the American Snuff Company, are they not?" "They are," replied the witness.

Percival S. Hill was recalled Monday, and his testimony of last week and that day covers several hundred pages of the record. Mr. Hill was questioned concerning nearly every detail of the organization of the various companies. He was asked to explain his correspondence concerning various more or less questionable methods.

It was clearly shown by the testimony that it is an established practice of the tobacco trust, after obtaining the business and plant of a former competitor, to keep the fact of the sale secret. The admission was forced by Judge McReynolds from Vice-President Hill that the tobacco trust controls the business of the Wells-Whitehead Company, of Wilson, N. C., but that the fact was concealed from the public and the company in question had sent its goods out bearing the union label. Mr. Hill would not admit the fact conveyed to the trade the impression that the company in question, the Wells-Whitehead Company, had no connection with the tobacco trust. "We always advised the Wells-Whitehead Company not to deny the ownership," Mr. Hill asserted.

The purchase of the Wells-Whitehead Company, Mr. Hill stated, had been a profitable one for the tobacco trust, except in the year 1905, when the company allowed 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 damaged cigarettes to be shipped out and afterwards had to redeem them.

Mr. Hill testified that the tobacco trust owned the Day and Night Tobacco Company, of Cincinnati, a supposedly independent concern. The fact that this ownership was not made public, he declared, was due solely to the wishes of the former sole owners, who still retained an interest. Concerning new brands of goods, Hill said they were always introduced at a loss, and that if they did not "go" after a fair trial they were abandoned.

The witness testified that a bonus had been paid the Reynolds Tobacco Company, of Bristol, Tenn., to close out, and that other factories were now making that company's former brands. A complaint by B. L. Delancey, a former stockholder of the Reynolds Tobacco Company, to the effect that he had been badly treated, was, Mr. Hill said, founded on misinformation.

Judge McReynolds intimated that B. L. Delancey, one of the heaviest stockholders in the Reynolds Tobacco Company, had been a heavy loser when the concern changed hands, but Mr. Hill insisted that Mr. Delancey was one of the best friends of the tobacco trust, whereupon Mr. McReynolds read a letter from Mr. Delancey, in which he complained of the treatment which his company had received and likened his concern to "a prisoner in chains," and called upon Mr. Hill to "break the shackles" and treat the company fairly or else let it go out of business with every possible profit to the stockholders.

RENT OF FLATIRON CIGAR STORE.

New York City retailers, Hill claimed, bought their supplies on closer margin than other dealers, and it was true that the tobacco trust had occasionally given allowances to the United Cigar Stores Company for pushing certain brands, and he recalled two instances in which allowances had been made on rentals, but denied that the American Company had ever paid part of the rent of the Flatiron Building store or was concerned in any way with the coupon scheme. He was compelled to admit, however, that the tobacco trust made a practice of lending money to jobbers throughout the country who pushed the company's products.

Mr. Hill was forced to admit that the tobacco trust made allowances to the United Cigar Stores for advertising the goods of the trust, based upon the increased sale of the brands when pushed to the utmost by the United.

"You allow the United Cigar Stores Company a discount of 2 per cent and an allowance of 5 per cent, do you not?" asked Judge McReynolds. "Yes," replied the witness. "How is the allowance determined?" "It is fixed by results." "Do you give a trade allowance on rent?" "It has been done in case a desirable territory for the introduction of our products was to be developed."

"Don't you pay the United Cigar Stores Company's rent in the Flatiron Building?" "No, sir. Not one cent, and we never did."

"Do any of the companies connected with the American Tobacco Company pay the rent?" "I can't say."

It also developed that the tobacco trust made a practice of lending money to jobbers throughout the country who were pushing its products.

BITTER ENMITY TO WARE-KRAMER TOBACCO COMPANY.

The witness asserted that he had never taken any active part in the affairs of the Wells-Whitehead Company, but was forced to admit that he felt free to make suggestions at any time. He admitted that he, as secretary of the American Tobacco Company, received daily reports from the Wells-Whitehead Company as to the sale of cigarettes and monthly reports as to the financial condition.

A letter addressed to W. M. Carter, of Wilson, N. C., taken from Mr. Hill's letter book, is extremely interesting, and shows the trust's concerted attempts to cripple the Ware-Kramer Tobacco Company, manufacturers of the White Rolls cigarettes. The letter read as follows:

"We are advised that a carload of cigarettes has been exported to China by the Ware-Kramer Tobacco Company. If possible I wish you would ascertain to what port these goods were shipped and the name of the consignee. If you can not learn the name, perhaps you can find out the markings on the cases, as well as the point in this country from which the goods were shipped by steamer."

"P. S. H."
[Percival S. Hill.]

The above letter was introduced just after Hill had protested at great length how friendly the tobacco trust was to the Ware-Kramer Tobacco Company, and would much rather see them succeed in business than otherwise. The letter came as a rude shock. Hill was forced to admit that he transmitted any information which he may have received to the British-American Tobacco Company, with the avowed object of shutting off the Ware-Kramer Tobacco Company's market in China. Such surprising reversals of form were by no means uncommon during Hill's testimony.

Another letter concerning White Rolls cigarettes, dictated at the tobacco trust headquarters, had the following interesting passage: "Regarding White Rolls, I hear they are selling some in Petersburg. Thought same to have dropped out for a time, but recently their men have been there again and started up some sales. I wish you could have this looked into, and see that some work is done there on Carolina Brights to counteract their effect in that locality."

Other letters of a similar character referring to the great increase in the sale of White Rolls in Durham, N. C., and in Danbury, Conn., were also offered in testimony, disclosing the merciless campaigning of the tobacco trust against the White Rolls cigarette and its ferocious competition against the Ware-Kramer Tobacco Company. Most of the letters are addressed to W. M. Carter or R. C. Briggs, of the Wells-Whitehead Company.

ATTACK ON CENTRAL UNION BRAND.

Hill was also questioned concerning other correspondence concerning Union Leader, a tobacco which was gotten out by the tobacco trust to drive Central Union, an independent tobacco, out of the market. Hill in his letters had complained that in a canvass by his men around lower New York City he had found Union Leader featured in only 24 stores out of 490 entered, while Central Union was in them all. The letters admit that the tobacco trust put out Union Leader especially to kill the Central Union tobacco.

Among the important questions also put to Mr. Hill were the following: "What is the attitude of union labor organization toward the American Tobacco Company?" "I don't know."

"Is it not true that they will not grant the union label to the products of factories controlled directly by the American Tobacco Company?" "I think not, but I don't know what you mean by 'controlled directly.'"

CATCHING HILL IN A TRAP.

Judge McReynolds then took up the relations between the tobacco trust and the United Cigar Stores in detail. "When was the United Cigar Stores Company organized?" he asked. "I don't remember," was the answer.

"Why was the ownership denied or concealed?"

"It never was denied or concealed. It simply was not made public."

At this point Judge McReynolds read a letter which the witness admitted he wrote to Frederick Estabrook, of Estabrook & Eaton, tobacco dealers, of Boston, September 29, 1902, in which he stated that it would be desirable to deny all rumors that the American Tobacco Company was behind the United Cigar Stores Company.

"Was it common to make such denials?"

"That is the only thing of the kind I know of."

Another important phase of Hill's testimony was concerning the business methods of the Metropolitan Tobacco Company, the corporation which enjoys exclusive jobbing relation with the tobacco trust.

"Does your company sell to any retailer in New York besides the United Cigar Stores Company?" asked Judge McReynolds.

"No; it sells to the New York trade through the Metropolitan Tobacco Company," was the answer.

"Are your city sales made on a uniform discount?"

"Practically so; but the discount actually varies. Tobacco is sold to the Metropolitan Company at list prices less 2 per cent; with an allowance of 5 per cent."

"What do you mean by allowance as distinguished from discount?"

"We make various allowances to companies that handle our goods and encourage the sale of our products and see that retail customers are supplied readily."

Mr. McReynolds then endeavored to get an idea of advertising methods and money expended in that way, but the witness's memory was so defective that little progress was made. Hill did say, however, that his estimate for 1906 was about \$10,000,000 spent in advertising and "the promotion of various schemes."

"How much was paid for newspaper advertisements?" asked Judge McReynolds.

"I don't know," replied the witness. "In 1906? I can not say positively, but I should think about \$100,000 or \$150,000."

"Is that all that was spent on newspaper advertising?"

"That is my estimate for the American Tobacco Company. The subsidiary companies have their separate items."

SCHEME TO CORNER SCRAP MARKET.

At another time Mr. Hill was forced to disclose an attempt to accomplish a combination of "scrap" tobacco among its manufacturers. A letter written by Mr. Hill to Mr. Pinkerton, of Milwaukee, telling of the attempts of Mr. Friedlander to establish such a combination was introduced by Judge McReynolds. Mr. Hill stated that personally he thought the plan a good one, but admitted that all of the manufacturers of scrap tobacco would not come in, hence the failure of the attempted corner.

DUKE'S PLOT TO DEMORALIZE TRADE.

This decidedly interesting letter, written by Percival S. Hill, in New York, January 10, 1903, to J. B. Cobb, president of the American Cigar Company, who was then in Habana, was introduced. James B. Duke ordered Hill to write it:

"DEAR MR. COBB: At Mr. Duke's suggestion I write you to the effect that a plan has about been decided upon, which differs from the one that was being considered before you left, and as in carrying out this plan it will be undesirable to give control of any brands to individuals in any part of the country, Mr. Duke requests me to write you, explaining it, so that in case any of our customers go to Habana you will not promise them control of any special brand.

"Mr. Rothschild, of the Waldorf-Astoria, will go to Habana tomorrow, Saturday, and we understand he will try to make arrangements to secure other Habana cigars than ours. Mr. Duke's idea is to make a confidential arrangement with Park & Tilford, and Acker, Merrill & Condit, by which they will sell Habana cigars both to the consumer and the retailer at the present cost, so that the retailer will buy at exactly the same prices as the consumer. Of course it will be necessary to keep this matter entirely confidential. The result will be a demoralization in business, for such a length of time as may be deemed desirable to continue on this basis.

"The final upshot will be that the importers will be forced into an arrangement by which they will maintain prices agreed upon. This plan is considered more desirable for the reason that if we tried to regulate the prices at the present time it would mean an advance in our goods to both wholesaler and retailer, which would give a decided advantage to independent factories in securing business; but we feel when our goods are sold to the consumer at present cost there will be no more opportunity to get much business for independent factories.

"Mr. Duke expects to have an interview with Park & Tilford to-day, to ascertain if this plan will be carried out by them.

"Will you kindly extend my regards to Mrs. Cobb and her daughter? Remember me to all the folks in Habana. With sincere regards for yourself, believe me,

"Very truly,

PERCIVAL S. HILL."

HILL'S LAME DEFENSE OF THE TRUST—TESTIMONY SO FULL OF HOLES AND EVASIONS A BACKWOODS LAW STUDENT COULD PICK IT TO PIECES.

There was a great foregathering of the bright lights of the tobacco trust legal department at Stamford, Conn., last Sunday, where they dined, and automobiles, and between times framed up a series of questions to be put to Percival S. Hill in the Government case when Special Attorney-General McReynolds should turn the witness over to them.

Judge McReynolds turned Hill over to Junius Parker, of the tobacco trust counsel, Monday, and according to the report in the Evening Sun of that date, the following amazing dialogue ensued:

"How many retail stores are there in the United States?"

"About 600,000."

"Of these how many are owned by the United Cigar Stores Company?"

"Less than 1,000."

[Admitting for the sake of argument that there are 600,000 places in the United States where cigars and tobacco are retailed, it is safe to assume that more than 560,000 of the number are in places where they are handled only as a side line, and usually in comparatively insignificant quantities. Of the remaining 40,000 places, many of them lead only a hand-to-mouth existence. There are something like 100 of the retail stores of the tobacco trust in Greater New York, and it is estimated that within the past five years they have driven some 500 independent dealers out of business.—Editor of Tobacco.]

"How many distributing concerns are there?"

"At least 5,000."

"How many of these does the American Tobacco Company own?"

"Only one."

In the bill of complaint filed by the United States Government against the tobacco trust, the following distributing concerns are named as codefendants, and the trust has in effect admitted that it owned and controlled them:

Crescent Cigar and Tobacco Company, New Orleans, capital \$20,000.
M. Blaskower Company, San Francisco, capital \$500,000.
R. D. Burnett Cigar Company, Birmingham, Ala.; capital \$415,000.
Cliff Well Cigar Company, Richmond, Va.; capital \$50,000.
J. & B. Moos, Chicago, capital \$150,000.
The J. & B. Moos Company, Cincinnati, capital \$200,000.
Dusel, Goodloe & Co., Philadelphia, capital \$72,000.
J. J. Goodrum Tobacco Company, Atlanta, Ga.; capital \$60,000.
Jordan, Gibson & Baum (Incorporated), Memphis, Tenn.; capital \$50,000.

Louisiana Tobacco Company (Limited), New Orleans, capital \$50,000.
The Smokers' Paradise Company, Atlantic City, N. J., \$75,000.

The above list takes no account of the Metropolitan Tobacco Company, of New York, which is as actually dominated by the tobacco trust as the fingers on Duke's right hand are dominated by Duke; neither is any account taken of the long line of branches and subsidiary concerns that are in turn controlled by the Metropolitan Tobacco Company and the various other concerns listed above. Nor is any reference made to the long list of concerns like the Acker, Merrill & Condit Company, in which the tobacco trust is a heavy stockholder, and which it permits to handle the brands of independent manufacturers only when it is scheming to kill such brands.

[Furthermore, the testimony framed up for Percival S. Hill, as above quoted, is intended to divert attention from one of the most important and vital phases of the whole matter, and that is: Before the Metropolitan Tobacco Company came into existence there were more than 100 substantial jobbers in New York, while to-day there are perhaps five that are worthy of being so classed. Some of the former jobbers were bought up by the Metropolitan, and the others were deliberately forced out of business by the ferocious competition with which they were assailed by the Metropolitan.—Editor of Tobacco.]

"Out of the 5,000 how many receive allowances from your company?"

"Two hundred and fifty-three."

"Nearly 4,700 are perfectly free and under no influence whatever from the American Tobacco Company?"

"Exactly."

[If there are 4,700 so-called "jobbing concerns" that are not controlled by the tobacco trust, either through ownership of stock or through loans of money made by some of its subsidiary branches—which is extremely doubtful—it must be taken into consideration that many of these independent concerns have but an insignificant volume of trade, most of them doing less business in a year than the Metropolitan To-

bacco Company does in a single day. Furthermore, a large majority of these independent jobbers handle vastly more goods produced by the tobacco trust than they do of the products of the independent dealers.—Editor of Tobacco.]

"Out of the 5,000 distributing companies, do any handle exclusively the products of the American Tobacco Company?"

"Not one; not even the one owned by us."

[As a matter of fact, it has from the beginning been the practice of the tobacco trust distributors and dealers to take hold of the product of an independent manufacturer, and make a pretense of selling it for the express purpose of killing the sale of a competitive brand. Quite recently the tobacco trust has made strenuous efforts to get possession of large quantities of the Romeo y Julieta brand of imported cigars, which it had planned to discredit with the smoker by selling them at cut prices in the trust's retail stores. Another instance in which one of the tobacco trust jobbers handled the cigarettes of an independent manufacturer only to kill them was also of recent occurrence. The cigarettes, which are wrapped in tin-foil, were treated to a few drops of water in each package, which caused them to turn black and then mold. The tin foil prevented the packages from presenting other than the ordinary appearance until the foil was removed, when the smoker naturally became disgusted with what he found and was probably effectually deterred from calling for that brand of cigarettes in the future. Similar instances in which the branches of the tobacco trust have handled the products of the independent manufacturers for the purpose of killing them might be multiplied indefinitely.—Editor of Tobacco.]

"Then there is no reason why other companies should not be able to compete openly?"

"None at all. Even from the 253 companies to which we pay allowances for promoting the sale of our goods they can get almost as much as we can. There is nothing to prevent any merchant from going into business except money."

[Every intelligent member of the trade knows that not only is it impossible for independent manufacturers to get the same service from the jobbers who have been assimilated by the tobacco trust that could be obtained from practically every jobber in the old days. There have been not merely scores and hundreds, but thousands of instances, where the jobbers controlled by the tobacco trust have positively refused to fill substantial orders booked by the salesmen for independent manufacturers and offering the jobber a handsome profit without risk or exertion on his part.—Editor of Tobacco.]

"Can anyone get the products of the American Tobacco Company?"

"Certainly, if he has the money; that is, outside of New York. Here they must get them through the Metropolitan Company."

[The tobacco trust has for several years past made a strenuous legal fight against E. Locker & Co. to establish its contention that it can refuse to sell its goods to anybody for any reason, or for no reason at all.—Editor of Tobacco.]

"Independent manufacturers of tobacco have opened business since the American Tobacco Company was formed, have they not?"

"Yes; several."

"And they are for the most part prosperous?"

"Very."

[It is doubtful if the witness, or anyone else, could name three prosperous independent manufacturers of tobacco in any form other than cigars or little cigars that have come into existence in the past seven years.—Editor of Tobacco.]

The lawyer then named the Scotten & Dillon Company, of Detroit; the Harris Company, of Readsville, N. C.; Bagley & Co., and the Globe Tobacco Company, of Detroit; Bloch Bros., of Wheeling, and the Dill Company, of Richmond, all of which the witness agreed were old-established companies and still prosperous. Failures in the tobacco business, said Mr. Hill, are due to bad management.

"Why, 90 per cent of our own products are failures," the witness added.

[Judging from the lack of quality in many of the tobacco trust's brands, there is not the slightest reason for doubting this statement.—Editor of Tobacco.]

The witness said that it had always been difficult to establish new brands on the market. Ninety per cent of the American company's business depended on fifty brands out of their total of 1,500, he said.

[Fully nineteen out of twenty of the largest selling brands of the tobacco trust to-day were placed on the market and established by independent concerns that have been since absorbed by the trust.—Editor of Tobacco.]

Counselor Parker then took up the manufacture and marketing of the various brands and endeavored to show that there could be nothing short of real competition, since brands could not be duplicated by other companies.

"Each brand has a secret formula, and my understanding is that it is impossible to duplicate them," said Mr. Hill.

[He might, with equal reason have said: "The moon is made of green cheese."—Editor of Tobacco.]

PROGRESSIVE CROOKEDNESS—RECORD OF TOBACCO-TRUST VILLAINIES DAILY GROWS MORE AND MORE AMAZING UNDER THE PROBE OF JUDGE McREYNOLDS.

An interesting feature in the proceedings in equity instituted by the United States Government against the tobacco trust last Tuesday was the recalling of Percival S. Hill, vice-president of the trust, whose testimony has been fraught with so many inconsistencies when compared with his personal correspondence of the past few years. Hill was called to verify some letters written to him by one Craft, of New Orleans. The letters disclosed a concerted attempt to put the Craft company out of business.

The fake independent companies, namely, Queen City Tobacco Company, Michigan Tobacco Company, and the Craft Tobacco Company, which were falsely masquerading as independents, were the chief topics of discussion Tuesday.

Admissions were drawn from Caleb C. Dula as to the secret workings of each company; how they tried to keep up an appearance of independence when in reality all three were owned and controlled by the tobacco trust. The correspondence between the officials of the different subordinate companies, which was submitted at this point, disclosed what frantic attempts were resorted to to allay suspicion respecting affiliation with the tobacco trust. Dula admitted that the Michigan Tobacco Company was a losing venture and estimated the financial loss at something like \$100,000.

Special Attorney-General McReynolds asked Dula to explain the relations of the trust with the Mengel Box Company. Several letters, taken from correspondence between Dula and Mr. Mengel, were produced, in which Dula asked for figures of box sales to various tobacco companies not connected with the tobacco trust.

"Was it Mr. Mengel's custom to send you from time to time figures of sales to independent companies?" asked Judge McReynolds.

"No, sir," was the reply. "I can't recall that he ever sent me any such information, though in conversation he may have given me some data."

"What do these letters mean in which you ask for letters?" asked the Government prosecutor, producing certain correspondence.

"I asked," the witness was forced to admit by his own letters, "but I do not remember; but I considered that I had a right to know, as a majority stockholder."

The three companies which Mr. Dula, judging from his correspondence, wished to get the figures of respecting the number of box sales were the Monarch, People's and Friedlander companies, and the letters produced showed that these figures were asked for repeatedly.

"Did the Conley Tin Foil Company sell tin foil to the American Tobacco Company and the independent companies as well?" asked Judge McReynolds of Dula.

"I know nothing at all about its business," was the reply.

"You did not, then, receive reports from it or the licorice companies?"

"No."

Mr. Dula was temporarily excused at 10.50 o'clock Tuesday morning, and Vice-President Hill was recalled. Hill admitted that the general direction of the Craft Tobacco Company, of New Orleans, was turned over to him by Dula after the latter had reorganized it upon its acquisition by the tobacco trust. Hill stated that both the Craft Company and the People's Tobacco Company, of New Orleans, were union companies. The latter, he said, had an approximate yearly output of 7,000,000 cigarettes and 30,000 pounds of smoking tobacco.

"What was the quality of the output; rather cheap, wasn't it?" inquired the Government counsel.

"I wouldn't say that. It was not particularly cheap; it was high-priced for its quality," said Hill.

Several letters were then read which were extracted from the correspondence which was held between Hill and Craft. The letters referred more especially to the question of union labor and the efforts of Mr. Craft to keep his connection with the tobacco trust a secret.

Several letters were also referred to concerning the struggle between the two labor unions in New Orleans, the regular union and the Tobacco Workers' Union, of which a man named Gurry was at the head.

When the Craft Company was acquired by the tobacco trust, Hill admitted that Mr. Craft had 25 per cent of the stock and the trust the balance. That connection, according to Hill, lasted until the early part of the present year, when all the stock was bought outright by Craft, who now, as Hill asserted again, owns the business. The tobacco trust, according to Hill, has no longer any connection with the Craft Tobacco Company. Hill maintained that the trust never did directly dictate to Craft as to the methods he should pursue, and that the latter always conducted his business as though it belonged to him absolutely.

"Was the Craft business prosperous?" was the next question.

"Yes; but not at the expense of anybody," Hill replied. "We found it necessary to interfere occasionally," Hill was finally forced to admit, "as Mr. Craft's policy was not always the wisest. For instance, his business was hurt by antagonizing customers when he espoused the cause of prohibition."

Mr. Hill was excused at noon and Dula recalled for redirect examination by Junius Parker, attorney of record for the tobacco trust.

The hearing Monday was devoted to the methods of the tobacco trust in acquiring control of independent companies. Counselor McReynolds brought out that the American and Continental tobacco companies had furnished the money for the organization of the Queen City Tobacco Company, of Cincinnati, putting forward J. L. Richards, a Boston financier, as the apparent independent backer of the concern. It is not generally known even now that the trust controlled the Queen City, Mr. Dula admitted.

It also developed that F. W. Galbraith, jr., manager of the Queen City Company, had written to Dula to the effect that his only fear was that "in some way the connection may leak out." The writer then advised that further correspondence be conducted under assumed names and that financial matters be transacted through the Boston man. Suspicion had been aroused among the labor unions, the writer said.

"The union is out for blood," he wrote, "as they expect they are being used by the tobacco trust. I have told them that we have absolutely no connection. We will have to be very careful or the connection will be exposed."

Other correspondence over the possible disclosure of the relations between the Queen City and the tobacco trust contained the statement that the labor unions were growing more and more suspicious.

"Richards must be prepared to stand them off (the labor unions) if they camp on his trail," wrote Mr. Galbraith.

Dula told of the secret acquisition by the tobacco trust of the Manufacturers' Tobacco Company, of Louisville, and Mr. McReynolds read a letter of Dula's asking the discipline of a salesman who had informed outsiders that the Continental and American companies were interested in the Manufacturers' Tobacco Company.

In a letter of Dula's on the formation of the Craft Tobacco Company, of New Orleans, in 1903, Augustus Craft, a New York jobber, wrote: "I will not only get their business, but I expect to cause a strike in the People's Tobacco Company plant."

This letter was also placed upon the record by Mr. McReynolds, who brought out that the Craft Company employed union labor and used union labels on its products, although the tobacco trust was behind it.

Mr. Dula also told of the purchase of the Pinkerton Tobacco Company, of Zanesville, Ohio, which was made with that secrecy that characterizes all of the underhanded deals of the tobacco trust.

Among the witnesses the latter part of last week was Francis S. Kinney, the former head of the Kinney Brothers Tobacco Company, which had its factory in Twenty-second street, near Ninth avenue, New York. When the American Tobacco Company was originally organized, according to Mr. Kinney, the Kinney Company had as its principal competitors W. Duke Sons & Co., Allen & Ginter, the Kimball Tobacco Company, and the Goodwin Tobacco Company.

"Competition was pretty active, and we spent a lot of money for advertising," Mr. Kinney testified. Ultimately an agreement was arrived at, and the five companies came together, Mr. Kinney stated.

"Who originated this idea of organizing the five companies?" asked Mr. McReynolds.

"I didn't, I know," said the witness. "The five companies finally came to an agreement, after some pretty stormy times. There was a good deal of friction, and I don't know how they finally smoothed it over, but they did."

Dula was also on the stand last week. Mr. McReynolds read into the record several letters which had passed between Dula and the other agents relating to the development of the business of the trust, particularly of the plug-tobacco trade. One of these related how they had one independent competitor "between the devil and the deep blue sea," as a result of price cutting, and another told how they were giving some one "a pretty hard rub."

One letter told of the efforts to buy out a competitor, and read: "We gave him some pretty hot shot and a dose of ipecac and made him so sick that I guess he will be ready to sell. There is no use in having a chicken with three legs when the third leg is in the way."

Mr. McReynolds read a letter from John Middleton, a southern representative, to Mr. Dula, dated March 14, 1906. Mr. Middleton wrote: "What do you think of the recent Supreme Court decision? I would like to have your views. Just draw on your imagination, and I think you will find some people sitting on a tack, points up, heads down."

"Who was sitting on the tack?" asked Mr. McReynolds.

"I don't know. You can infer as well as I can," retorted Mr. Dula. Another letter indicating an effort upon the part of the American Tobacco Company to get control of the Globe Tobacco Company, of Detroit, was also introduced in evidence. A confidential agent was to offer \$200 a share for the stock of the Globe Company, but he failed to get the company.

Among the letters in which Special Attorney-General McReynolds showed particular interest was one referring to the position of the R. A. Patterson Tobacco Company, of Richmond, in the Independent Tobacco Manufacturers' Association, written by Dula, in which the writer gave it as his opinion that President Landstreet of the Patterson company should resign from the association. The reason given for the advice was what the writer termed the "unbusinesslike" thing requiring every member to make an affidavit to the effect that he had no connection with the tobacco trust. Dula testified that the Patterson Company was controlled by the tobacco trust.

"How many companies connected with the American Tobacco Company were members of the association?" asked Mr. McReynolds.

"I don't know," replied the witness, "but I presume those who are members held their membership before the American Tobacco Company was organized."

The attention of the witness was called to letters he had sent to Alexander Hamilton at Petersburg, Va., inclosing checks, \$1,067 one month, \$951 another. He said that Hamilton was the representative of the Bland Tobacco Company. He was not in the employ of the tobacco trust, and witness said he was not certain for what purpose the money was paid.

"Was not that money paid as a subsidy to the Bland Company?" asked Mr. McReynolds.

"I presume so," replied Mr. Dula.

HOW THE TRUST DRIVES OUT COMPETITORS—A PRACTICAL ILLUSTRATION OF ITS METHODS PLACED BEFORE SPECIAL ATTORNEY-GENERAL McREYNOLDS.

[Special to Tobacco.]

NEWARK, N. J., December 10, 1907.

The following letter was forwarded this week to Special Attorney-General McReynolds, in charge of the prosecution of the tobacco trust, by the H. A. Rosner Cigar Company, of Newark:

Special Attorney-General McReynolds, New York.

JUDGE McREYNOLDS:

We wish to draw your attention to an incident such as is being brought out by your investigation.

About a month ago a Mr. Davis, representative of the United Cigar Stores Company, offered I. Boyland, No. 251 Main street, Orange, N. J., \$1,000 for his cigar store, situated at the above address. Prior to this the United Cigar Stores Company tried to lease a store in the immediate neighborhood, but were unsuccessful. After the refusal of Mr. Boyland to dispose of his store, Mr. George Whelan, president of the United Cigar Stores Company, began negotiations with the landlord of Boyland's store—a Mr. Reynolds, of Munn avenue, East Orange, N. J.—for the lease of the store adjoining the store now occupied as a cigar store by said Boyland, in the same building, and owned by the same landlord. The lease of the store had just expired. The United Cigar Stores Company offered \$1,800 for the store, and the landlord accepted. The present tenants are paying \$1,200 per year. If you care to use this case as an illustration of the trust's efforts to put a man, who has been in business for ten years, out of business, Mr. Boyland will be pleased to testify at any time that you may select.

Very truly, yours,

H. A. ROSNER CIGAR COMPANY.

TOBACCO TRUST'S DIRTY WORK—MORE VICIOUS METHODS DETAILED BY ITS OWN OFFICERS—SPIES VISIT INDEPENDENT STORES—PLOT TO CORRUPT SCRAP TOBACCO.

The Government suit against the tobacco trust is becoming more and more significant as the sessions continue and Special Attorney-General J. C. McReynolds and his assistant, William P. Grosvenor, get the opportunity to build up their framework of testimony.

The record Tuesday was filled with many a telling point which must go far in establishing proof of the Government's contention.

The first witness called Tuesday was Thomas Smith, a buyer for the American Snuff Company. He testified to the methods and negotiations entered into whereby the trust acquired its raw material. He was followed by A. B. Christian, secretary of the American Snuff Company. Mr. Christian was cross-examined with great thoroughness concerning the ramifications of his concern. He was forced to disclose the fact that Percival S. Hill, James B. Duke, and C. C. Dula were stockholders of the American Snuff Company and on the directorate, as they are in the American Tobacco Company. Mr. Christian tried to create the impression, however, that Duke, Hill, and Dula exercised no control over the Snuff Company, asserting that they seldom attended the meetings.

Judge McReynolds examined the witness at great length regarding the various organizations of the different snuff companies now controlled by the tobacco trust; he showed that there was, after all the denials of the trust witnesses, a general management over all, and that the American Snuff Company was supplying all the under snuff companies of the trust.

Perhaps the most important witness on the stand Friday was G. B. Hutchins, chief buyer of scrap tobacco for the tobacco trust, whose office is at 111 Fifth avenue, and who receives his mail in the same mail box of the general post-office as his associates. Hutchins admitted

outright on the stand that the ring higher up, Duke and his associates, had juggled through deals whereby they had acquired the Penn Tobacco Company, the Queen City, the Day and Night, and all the rest of the tobacco companies that were acquired secretly without his knowledge. Although he was at the head of the scrap tobacco department and had deals with these companies, Mr. Hutchins claimed that he knew nothing about what was going on until the equity bill was filed in the Government suit.

The scrap tobacco corner, which was manipulated by the tobacco trust in January, 1906, was shown up in masterly fashion by Judge McReynolds. The tobacco trust had put the fake Queen City firm in the field, and with its other subsidiary companies which it secretly owned began to acquire the scrap tobacco and juggle the market price until it was far above 20 cents a pound. The trust had a big supply, but Friedlander, of the old Day and Night Company, which was at that time independent, did not, and the price was inflated so that it was more than the finished tobacco product made from the scraps would sell for.

The proceedings Monday were opened by Special Attorney-General McReynolds recalling Percival S. Hill to the stand, making the fourth recall of that witness.

Correspondence dictated and signed by Hill disclosed the fact that he sent spies around to various independent stands and stores to ascertain what particular brands of cigars and cigarettes were being featured by the independents. A spy would enter a retailer's establishment and ask for a good 10-cent cigar. At the Hoffman House, one of the places visited, the clerk behind the counter put forward a Robert Burns cigar. In another instance the tobacco trust spy asked for a good little cigar for 15 cents, and the clerk brought forward Robert Burns Petite Ducs. After ascertaining that the independent brands were being pushed, Hill would write to the various tobacco trust salesmen and sharply ask them why it was that independent goods were being featured in such a manner.

Hill's letters to salesmen all stipulated that the letter be kept absolutely secret. He would apprise his salesmen where certain brands of little cigars were selling heavily and direct the tobacco trust salesmen to adopt measures to stop it.

Hill was also asked by Counselor Parker, of the tobacco trust, about the exact amount of money advanced by the trust to the United Cigar Stores Company, both in advertising allowances and otherwise. Hill went into a gruesome story of how other manufacturers wanted to get the United Stores to use their goods in window displays and tried to justify the enormous subsidies of the trust to the United company in that manner.

"What means did you adopt for acquiring this information about how these brands of little cigars were sold?" asked Judge McReynolds. "I don't recall," said Hill, and everybody cast ominous glances in the direction of the witness. Hill was also asked to identify certain correspondence which he wrote to the effect that the tobacco trust had better push its proposed contracts and agreements in Australia and acquire a practical monopoly in that country.

A remarkable instance of Mr. Hill's high-handedness was a letter addressed to Thomas J. Luce, president of the Acker, Merrill & Condit Company, in which Hill deprecates the fact that Luce had purchased a small lot of cigarettes from an independent manufacturer. Hill denounced the cigarettes as trash and inquired of Luce by what right he had to handle independent goods anyway.

Upon cross-examination by Counselor Parker, Hill made a lame attempt to justify his secret methods of finding out the extent and destination of the goods of independent manufacturers by saying that he wanted to stimulate the efforts of his own salesmen.

After Hill had been excused C. C. Dula was recalled to identify certain correspondence which appertained to plug tobacco and which dovetailed into his other testimony.

With the exception of Hill, the most damaging admissions were drawn from John Conley, of the Conley Tin Foil Company, a new witness. Mr. Conley proved to be most effeminate in his manner and seemed so willing to disclose everything that he knew, so that the proof on the records is about as complete as a thorough lawyer like McReynolds, assisted by a good witness, could make it.

Conley began his testimony by stating that the original firm name of his concern was Thomas Conley & Sons, and that it did business for the tobacco trust. His firm got into financial difficulties, he said, and really didn't know what to do; when, lo and behold, a monster tin foil trust appeared and threatened to absorb the Conley outfit; whereupon the Conley family, to save itself, turned from the tin foil trust and jumped into the outstretched arms of the tobacco trust.

Conley, in answer to questions put by Judge McReynolds, admitted that he furnished tin foil to a great list of concerns now controlled by the tobacco trust. He estimated the total output of his concern for the past three years, which showed that the volume of business increased each year since the tobacco trust was being entered to. He admitted that he sold to the trust at a certain percentage above actual cost of production to insure a small dividend. When pressed by Judge McReynolds, he admitted that after the tobacco trust was provided with tin foil the Conley firm frequently sold to independents below cost, thus disclosing the fact that the Conley Company was trying to kill off its independent competitors in the manufacture of tin foil.

Mr. Conley also described in detail the negotiations which resulted in the tobacco trust acquiring this concern. He admitted that the trust advanced money to the Conley Company frequently and virtually admitted that the trust absolutely controlled the Conley Company.

Thursday J. B. Cobb, president of the American Cigar Company and vice-president of the American Tobacco Company, was called to the stand by Judge McReynolds.

Cobb endeavored to show that the formation of the tobacco trust and its subsidiaries had been beneficial to the trade, but the task proved too much for him. Cobb said in support of his position that seventeen years of advertising had increased the demand for Burley leaf tobacco so that 150,000 acres are under cultivation to-day on the same land where cotton was formerly grown, as the tobacco was considered more profitable than cotton and had a more certain market, since the tobacco trust was constantly in the market with ready cash.

George J. Whelan, president of the United Cigar Stores Company, was the principal witness Friday. Mr. Whelan unobscured himself at great length and recited the vicissitudes of the United Cigar Stores Company from its inception.

Whelan admitted the well-known fact that the tobacco trust owns 51 per cent of the stock of the United Company, and said that the latter company in 1906 paid 40 per cent dividend on its common stock. Whelan further testified that the United Company at the present time had 405 stores. He claimed that the tobacco trust officers did not have a voice in the management of the United Company, and

really tried to look truthful while he said it. Whelan also testified that when he started the chain of stores he could not interest the trust, but he capitalized for \$2,000,000 so that people would think that the trust was behind it. Whelan said that later he got the trust interested, and that 12 per cent had been paid on the common stock in 1904, 20 per cent in 1905, and 40 per cent in 1906.

CONGRESSMAN TAWNEY TO LEAD—GREAT FIGHT AGAINST GIFT COUPONS PLANNED AT RECENT CONFERENCE—STRONG SUPPORT HAS ALREADY BEEN ENLISTED.

[Special to Tobacco.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 16, 1907.

Representative TAWNEY, who has twice led a splendid fight in the interests of the independent cigar and tobacco interests of the United States for the enactment of legislation which should sound the death knell of the pernicious and iniquitous gift-coupon system, is ready once more put forth his best efforts in the same good cause.

Tobacco is in a position to make the exclusive but authoritative announcement that an anticoupon bill will be introduced in Congress by Representative TAWNEY early in January, and that he will fight for its enactment with all the resources at his command.

A conference of several Members of Congress interested in the passage of such a measure, because they feel that it is earnestly desired by a large number of their constituents as well as by practically every member of the independent cigar and tobacco trade, was held recently, when a surprisingly large amount of support was pledged toward whatever anticoupon bill might be determined upon as best meeting the needs of the trade.

It was found that many powerful interests were in favor of an anticoupon law and that a number of prominent Congressmen were not only ready and willing but anxious to lend the weight of their voices and influence in favor of an anticoupon bill when introduced.

In view of the splendid fights which Congressman TAWNEY had led against the gift-coupon sharks in the past, it was unanimously agreed that he was the one of all others to introduce the proposed bill at the present session.

Congressman TAWNEY said that he would gladly do this and that his only anxiety was to introduce such a bill as should best meet the views of the independent members of the cigar and tobacco trade. If it was thought that the former Tawney bill, with certain slight changes that experience had suggested as desirable, would best meet the requirements, well and good; but if, on the other hand, a new bill should be deemed necessary, he would cheerfully lay the old bill aside and introduce an entirely different draft.

It seemed to be the consensus of opinion of those present at the conference, however, that it would indeed be a most difficult matter to devise a bill as certain to kill the gift coupon in connection with the manufacture and sale of cigars, cigarettes, manufactured tobacco, and snuff as the Tawney bill, and in all probability that bill with certain minor changes, which strengthen rather than weaken it, will be introduced in Congress during the first week in January.

One of the strongest arguments advanced in favor of the Tawney bill was that when it was before an earlier session of Congress it met with the bitterest, most intense, and most strenuous opposition from the tobacco trust.

The tobacco trust at that time not only maintained a powerful lobby at Washington, but it poured out money like water to encompass the defeat of the Tawney bill. Something like a score of the powerful subsidiary companies of the tobacco trust which were at that time falsely masquerading as independent concerns were ordered to hurry their representatives to Washington and to engage expensive legal counsel to aid in the fight.

Indeed, the strongest and most effective argument that was advanced against the Tawney bill at that time was the statement that not all of the independent manufacturers and jobbers were agreed in favor of the measure, and the names of a number of at that time supposedly independent concerns were quoted as opposed to the bill.

The evidence drawn out at the trial of the tobacco trust now in progress has developed the fact that not only were all of those supposedly independent concerns secretly owned or controlled by the trust, but that orders for them to fight the Tawney bill were actually sent out from the inner circle at 111 Fifth avenue, New York.

It was pointed out at the recent conference that before the tobacco trust put up this tremendous fight against the Tawney bill it had obtained copies of the measure and had them minutely scrutinized and carefully studied not only by its own legal department, but by many of the ablest and highest-priced lawyers in the land, and that had they been able to discover any hope that it could have been set aside as unconstitutional, or its provisions legally evaded, the trust would not have expended an enormous sum and bent its every energy to bring about its defeat.

The fact that the tobacco trust so bitterly opposed the Tawney bill before was urged as the strongest of all reasons why it should be revived and passed, as it seems now practically assured that it will be at the present session of Congress.

REGULUS II.

TOBACCO TRUST MAKES ANSWER—PLEADS THAT ITS BRITISH-AMERICAN BRANCH IS AN ENGLISH CORPORATION.

[Special to Tobacco.]

NORFOLK, December 16, 1907.

The British-American Tobacco Company, branch of the tobacco trust, claiming ownership of the 8,750,000 cigarettes valued at \$7,272.50, which were seized by the Government in October while in transit here for export to England and Singapore, to-day filed its answer to the information filed by the Government for the forfeiture of the cigarettes because of alleged combinations and conspiracies in restraint of trade in violation of the Sherman antitrust laws.

The respondent asserts that if it is possible for the law under which the Government is proceeding in this case to be construed as authorizing the seizure of said cigarettes in advance of a judicial determination that this respondent is violating said law, the said act would be unconstitutional because confiscatory and entailing unreasonable loss to this respondent, whose business would be annihilated by the repeated seizures before a legal test of the law could be made.

The British-American branch of the trust admits that for business convenience it maintains an office in New York, but says it is a British corporation and that all its contracts were entered into on British soil and are not subject to American statutes.

WELLS-WHITEHEAD COMPANY MAY BE WOUND UP—TOBACCO TRUST IS SAID TO BE CONSIDERING SHUTTING DOWN OF CIGARETTE PLANT AT WILSON, N. C.

[Special to Tobacco.]

WILSON, N. C., December 16, 1907.

Although the utmost secrecy is being maintained as to the future plans of the tobacco trust in connection with its Wells-Whitehead branch in Wilson, there are whispers in the matter of discontinuing the local cigarette factory and winding up the corporate existence of the company.

It is well known that the cigarette output of the Wells-Whitehead Company has been steadily and rapidly diminishing during the past two or three years, and it is further pointed out that the trust has recently ceased its efforts to push the brands of cigarettes made in the Wells-Whitehead factory in many localities where they formerly obtained a considerable sale, and is seemingly striving to replace the product of the Wilson branch with a brand of cigarettes made in one of the trust factories in Richmond, Va.

The Wells-Whitehead Company was originally organized as an independent concern and employed only union labor. It was later secretly purchased by the tobacco trust, although it continued for some time thereafter to masquerade as an independent concern. When it became generally known that it was a branch of the tobacco trust the sale of its cigarettes began to diminish in certain sections where there is a strong antitrust feeling, and the sales still further diminished when the Wilson factory was deprived of the union label because of its affiliation with the tobacco trust.

The recent testimony of P. S. Hill at the tobacco trust trial in New York that some 10,000,000 badly damaged cigarettes were sent out from this factory in one year, making a big hole in the profits, is also taken as an indication that the trust has found the Wells-Whitehead anything but the revenue producer which it was expected to be when it was secretly acquired.

NORTH STATE.

SUIT AGAINST TOBACCO TRUST—ACTION BEGUN BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR IN MASON COUNTY, KY., WHICH WILL BE FOLLOWED WITH INTEREST.

[Special to Tobacco.]

MAYSVILLE, KY., December 16, 1907.

Suit was recently filed in the Mason circuit court by Commonwealth's Attorney Mathew J. Hennessey against the tobacco trust, which is being followed with eager interest in all sections of Kentucky where the trust does business. The petition in part is as follows:

"Commonwealth of Kentucky, plaintiff, against American Tobacco Company, defendant. The plaintiff states that the defendant is a corporation created under and by the laws of one of the States of the United States, the name of the particular one being unknown to plaintiffs, with power to contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued by its corporate name; that it did, in the county of Mason and State of Kentucky, within the last twelve months and before the institution of this action, unlawfully create, establish, organize, enter into, and become a member of a party to and interested in a pool, trust, combine, agreement, confederation, and understanding with, and with other corporations, partnerships, persons, individuals, and associations of persons to the plaintiff unknown, which combination was so created, established, organized, and entered into for the purpose of regulating, controlling, and fixing the price of merchandise, manufactured articles and property, to wit: Tobacco, both in the leaf and manufacturing, and in pursuance of said pool, trust, combination, and agreement, did unlawfully control, regulate, and fix the price of said tobacco in said county during said time, to plaintiff's damage, in the sum of \$5,000, whereof plaintiff prays judgment against defendant for above sums."

BOURBON.

TOBACCO TRUST OFFICIALS AND PERJURY.

Perjury: The willful giving under oath lawfully administered in a judicial proceeding of false testimony in regard to a matter or thing material to the issue or point of inquiry. (Definition from the Standard Dictionary.)

A person who swears or affirms that he will truly testify, declare, depose, or certify, or that in any declaration, deposition, certificate, affidavit, or other writing, by him subscribed as true in an action or special proceeding, or upon any hearing or inquiry, or on any occasion in which an oath is required by law, or is necessary for the prosecution or defense of a private right, or for the ends of public justice, in such action or proceeding, or on such hearing, inquiry, or other occasion, and willfully and knowingly testifies, declares, deposes, or certifies falsely in any material matter, or states in his testimony, declaration, deposition, affidavit, or certificate which he knows to be false, is guilty of perjury. (Digest from Chapter V, section 96, of the New York Penal Code.)

The crime of perjury is further defined in the statutes of the United States, under which the case of the tobacco trust is now on trial, and the punishment explicitly prescribed for that crime is a long term of years in prison.

It must be apparent to every intelligent member of the trade that practically every officer of the tobacco trust who has thus far taken the witness stand in the case against the tobacco trust now on trial before the United States district court has laid himself liable to prosecution for the crime of perjury.

In more than one instance the witnesses have deliberately walked into the traps set for them by Special Attorney-General McReynolds, and testified with great positiveness to certain things, only to be contradicted with equal positiveness by the introduction of letters written by them and bearing their own signatures.

Thus, for example, Vice-President Hill testified that the ownership of the United Cigar Stores by the tobacco trust had never been denied or concealed, only to be immediately confronted with a letter bearing his own signature, urging a well-known Boston firm, whose relations were known to be particularly intimate with the tobacco trust, to deny all reports that the trust was behind the United Stores.

Then again Hill testified positively that the tobacco trust did not pay one cent toward the rent of the store in the Flatiron Building, and never had. Now, while the Government prosecutor did not have letters to refute this statement on the part of Hill, its falsity could have been established without difficulty as the real-estate broker who negotiated the lease of the premises in the Flatiron Building to the tobacco trust, long before the building was completed, published the fact broadcast that the tobacco trust was the lessee.

Furthermore the tobacco trust made overtures to Robert E. Lane, the well-known independent cigar dealer, to take the Flatiron store

under an arrangement by which the trust offered to meet a considerable part of the rent on condition that Mr. Lane would push trust goods.

Tobacco knows that much pressure was brought to bear upon Mr. Lane by different trust officials to induce him to accept the proposition, and that it was not until after he had irrevocably turned it down that it was finally decided to open the place as a United Store.

Moreover, the testimony of the tobacco-trust witnesses is not only contradicted by their own letters, but the witnesses themselves contradict each other. Thus Vice-President Hill laid great stress upon the assertion that the tobacco trust had never sought to conceal its connection with any of its branch concerns, while Vice-President Dula testified with a wealth of interesting detail that the trust had repeatedly caused companies which it owned and controlled to masquerade as independents and to offer their products to the trade and to the public as independent products, "not made by the trust."

Both Hill and Dula denied on the witness stand that they had sought by devious and underhanded ways to obtain information as to the output of independent competitors, only to later admit various specific instances in which they sought for and received information of that character.

Vice-President Dula testified in set terms that there had never been any attempt on the part of the tobacco trust to boycott or slander the output of independent manufacturers, nor was there ever any hindrance to the free distribution of independent products put in their way by the trust. This most amazing testimony was flatly contradicted, not only by numerous letters, but by damaging admissions from the lips of both Dula and Hill.

To the mind of the ordinary layman, therefore, it must appear quite possible that if all other methods of punishing the tobacco trust fail, a number of the prominent officers of the trust might be indicted and probably ultimately sent to the penitentiary for long terms for violation of the statutes against perjury.

THE MASK IS OFF AT LAST.

By distorting the evidence at the tobacco trust trial, with an evident purpose to discredit one of the staunchest independent houses in the trade, and then refusing to repair the wrong, one of Tobacco's would-be contemporaries has shown that—while it might be base flattery to call it a wolf in sheep's clothing—it has masqueraded as a pretended friend of the independents, apparently that it might stab one of them in the back at the first opportunity.

Tobacco is glad to see the mask laid aside. Independent interests have less to fear from an open enemy doing scavenger work for the trust than from a pretended friend who would entice them to destruction in the gift-coupon quagmire.

TRUTHS ABOUT TOBACCO TRUST—COURAGEOUS EDITORIAL UTTERANCES OF A GREAT, CONSERVATIVE DAILY NEWSPAPER IN KENTUCKY—MASTERLY ARRAIGNMENT OF VICIOUS METHODS.

[Special to Tobacco.]

LEXINGTON, KY., December 16, 1907.

The Lexington Herald, one of the most substantial and conservatively edited daily newspapers in Kentucky, has the courage to handle the iniquitous tobacco trust without gloves. It speaks with authority and voices the sentiments of the best elements in the great burley tobacco-growing district in which it circulates.

The Herald has at all times deprecated opposition to the laws of the Commonwealth, and been a staunch supporter of constituted authority, but at the same time it is not blind to the fact that the underlying cause of the present turbulent conditions in various sections is the vicious methods of the tobacco trust and its vassals.

In a recent issue of the Herald was printed a powerful editorial based upon a study of the tobacco trust in the current issue of a great popular magazine. This editorial shows a keen insight into the methods of the tobacco trust, coupled with a courage which is all too rare in a vast majority of the daily newspapers of the United States. The editorial in the Herald was, in part, as follows:

"The ordinary mind is staggered by the amount of securities issued in the various steps which have led to the formation of the tobacco trust, on which the people of America pay dividends. Mr. Russell writes as if he were both careful and accurate, and so far we know no reason to doubt his statements or discredit his conclusions.

"The effect of the formation of the tobacco trust is that the people of America, the consumers and producers of tobacco, are paying each year millions of dollars upon stock which represents nothing except the capitalization of the violation of the law, which resulted in the formation of this trust and the injection of oceans of water into its securities."

"We can not attempt to give even a summary of Mr. Russell's account. But we recommend it to the consideration of every reader of the Herald and particularly to those who believe that the recent Republican Administrations have enforced the laws against such combinations.

"According to Mr. Russell's article the total capitalization of the American tobacco trust, including the various subsidiary and dummy companies, is about \$500,000,000, a growth in less than eighteen years from assets worth less than \$20,000,000.

"On this huge amount of stock the people have been and are paying dividends which the trust is enabled to squeeze out by its control of the purchase of the raw product and the sale of the finished product.

"As is well known to the readers of the Herald, we have urged the burley tobacco growers to observe the law. We have stated, what is the fact, that this section of the State must not be disgraced by lawless outbreaks such as have disgraced the southwestern section.

"We have incurred the resentment of some of those most heavily interested in the growing of burley tobacco by emphasizing the necessity for the observance of the law and pointing out as clearly as we are able that, no matter what happens, the growers and producers of tobacco will harm only themselves by any attempts to use force or coercion in this section of the State. And we repeat with all emphasis everything we have said along these lines.

"And yet when one reads the account of the formation and conduct of the American tobacco trust and realizes how it has been organized and is being conducted in violation of the fundamental principles of law and equity and morals; when one realizes how, through its efforts to control the cigar stores, individuals have been ruined by its unfair competition, and through its power to control the prices of tobacco whole communities have been thrown into a state of lawlessness and hundreds of families put into what is practical want, it brings a realization of the failure of our National and State governments to enforce the law against such organizations as this.

"From the members of 'the peaceful armies of invasion' who first warn in a courteous, but not pleasant, manner those who do not agree with their views in regard to the sale of tobacco, to 'the night riders,' who, under the cover of darkness, apply a torch to the barn of their neighbors or commit assassination, the producer who violates the law is amenable to the ordinary criminal processes, and for the salvation of the civilization of the tobacco districts must be made to respect those statutes and be punished when they are violated. But for the past fifteen years such men as organized the tobacco trust, and through it have wrung from the American people millions of dollars by the evasion or violation of the law, have been immune from punishment, and the attempt of the individual growers to better their condition by violence affects in no way the profits of these men.

"In our judgment the remedy can come only by national laws enforced by national officers. The tobacco trust must either be dissolved or regulated by national laws which are enforced, and that party which stands for the enforcement of such laws must be put in power."

There can be no question, but if there were more daily newspapers with the conservatism and courage manifested in these utterances of the Lexington Herald, the day would speedily come when the tobacco trust would be shorn of its power to wreak harm upon the people of all classes and in all sections of the United States.

JUSTICE.

[Editorial in New York Journal of Commerce.]

SAMPLE TRUST METHODS.

In the taking of testimony before the United States commissioner in the suit against the tobacco trust some choice examples of the methods used in forming that combination are brought out. The honorable character of the proceedings is illustrated by the secrecy observed in gathering in some of the constituent concerns. One of the vice-presidents of the American Tobacco Company has told how he arranged the organization of a company in Cincinnati which was to be ostensibly independent. The American and Continental companies furnished the money and were the real owners, but a Boston financier was put forward as the backer and correspondence reveals the highly honorable means adopted to insure secrecy. The "independent" manager advised that correspondence be conducted under assumed names, and in one of his letters he told how he had assured a suspicious labor union that "we have absolutely no connection" with the trust, adding "we will have to be very careful or the connection will be exposed."

A company at Louisville was secretly acquired by buying up the stock, and as soon as full control was secured the plant was dismantled and the business abandoned at that point. Other correspondence shows how a company was formed in New Orleans for the purpose of running out an established concern there and occupying the field. The man employed to organize the new company wrote that he would make it a business success and run the People's Tobacco Company out of business. "I will not only get their business," he wrote, "but I expect to cause a strike in the People's Company factory." Such were the noble tactics pursued in building up a beneficent monopoly in the tobacco business. These are only sample illustrations of the methods used.

CASE AGAINST TRUST RESUMED—HOW THE LIGGETT & MYERS COMPANY WAS ACQUIRED—TRUST'S CAMELS CAPTURED BY BRIGANDS—FINES OF SPIES WERE PAID WITHOUT QUESTION.

The suit of the United States Government against the tobacco trust was resumed Monday and the work of adding to the already long record went merrily on.

The last witness Tuesday was Watson B. Dickerman, of the New York brokerage firm of Moore & Schley, who testified that he was a stockholder of the American Tobacco Company, owning \$300,000 worth of stock. He also stated in response to the questions put by Special Attorney-General McReynolds that the firm of Moore & Schley probably owned a small amount in its own right, but that most of the tobacco-trust stock that Moore & Schley carried was for customers.

Judge McReynolds then questioned Mr. Dickerman regarding the purchase of the Liggett & Myers Company, in 1899, and asked if that was not the largest manufacturer of plug tobacco at that time. Mr. Dickerman stated that he bought the Liggett & Myers Company, but he was uncertain as to whether it was the largest or not. Mr. Dickerman stated that he paid \$12,500,000 for the Liggett & Myers Company, and that he bought it for the Continental Tobacco Company, which was the leading tobacco-trust organization at that time. Mr. Dickerman said that he sold the great plug-tobacco concern to the Continental Tobacco Company for 175,000 shares of Continental Tobacco Company stock, common, and for 175,000 shares of stock in the same company, preferred, together with \$5,000,000 in cash, which in all totaled up to a valuation of \$17,500,000. The tobacco-trust counsel tried to show that the Continental Tobacco Company stock at the time of the purchase of the Liggett & Myers Company was below par value of \$100 a share and suffered many fluctuations, consequently the price could not be deemed to be excessive.

Judge McReynolds inquired from the witness whether he purchased the assets or the capital of the stock. "I purchased the whole property," Mr. Dickerman replied.

"Who furnished the money in the purchase?" asked Judge McReynolds.

"The money was furnished by different people," replied the witness.

"Who were they?" asked the Government prosecutor.

"O. H. Bain, James B. Duke, Thomas F. Ryan, Peter A. B. Widener, and Herbert L. Terrill."

"From whom was the capital stock bought?" asked Judge McReynolds.

"It was bought from different parties. Part of the stock was bought from George P. Butler. I obtained an option on the stock which he had; with respect to the rest of the stock, I made a contract to purchase it; it was held by the Myers people and was turned over to me in two separate lots."

The witness stated that though the stock which he secured by the purchase totaled up to \$35,000,000 in valuation, nevertheless it was not worth that amount of money. That, he claimed, was the nominal value and not the actual value.

The counsel for the tobacco trust tried to show that the stock was of a depreciating value, and also to show that Mr. Dickerman made the offer to the tobacco trust clique before a meeting of the board of directors at which neither Duke, Ryan, and Widener were present.

Earlier in the day, Tuesday, Karl Jungbluth, president of the McAndrews & Forbes Company branch of the tobacco trust, was recalled to complete the thread of evidence in the licorice transactions of the trust. Jungbluth was cross-examined at great length and no detail was lost

sight of in welding the chain of evidence as to the monopoly of licorice. The first thing Tuesday morning Jungbluth was asked where his office was. He replied, like all the rest, 111 Fifth avenue. He admitted it was elsewhere up to a year or so ago, but now he was directly under the sheltering wing of Duke and his disciples.

"Your company has the same law department as the American Tobacco Company, has it not?" asked General McReynolds. The witness said "Yes." The Government counsel asked Jungbluth several questions to ascertain whether he knew just what was going on in the tobacco companies at 111 Fifth avenue, but it appeared that he did not, because he stated that he did not know that the Pinkerton Tobacco Company, of Zanesville, Ohio, was part and parcel of the tobacco trust until the Government bill in the present suit was filed. The witness appeared equally ignorant about numerous other secret deals which he was asked about.

Jungbluth was questioned at great length about the licorice business, what percentage of the world's product of licorice was used in tobacco, what percentage the McAndrews & Forbes Company furnished, how much of the total output of the McAndrews & Forbes Company was furnished by the tobacco trust. To the latter query, 82 per cent was the answer, and Jungbluth could only estimate roughly about the world's product. Jungbluth admitted that the amount of licorice paste furnished to the tobacco trust was only 50 or 60 per cent before the last McAndrews & Forbes incorporation and capitalization.

He stated that the price of licorice was 7½ cents a pound and then several years ago it was raised to 8 cents. He went on further to say that the risks and perils incident to procuring the licorice root in the Orient forced the McAndrews & Forbes Company to raise the price to independent manufacturers to 9 cents a pound, except those who had long-term agreements, and the latter were to get theirs for 8 cents.

Jungbluth spun a tale that sounded like Baron Munchausen when he stated that bandits stole fifty camels belonging to the trust in the Orient; that the Turks exacted heavy tributes in the shape of tithes upon the profits, and that even now they were negotiating, at 111 Fifth avenue, with certain potentates who had to have a share in the graft. There were other disturbances in Asia Minor, Syria, and Turkish Arabia. Even the Russian-Japanese war nearly put the McAndrews & Forbes Company on its uppers. When the bandits stole the camels, the camels had licorice root on their backs and the bandits demanded certain ransom, which was paid, or they were going to saunter off with the camels and the licorice. But Jungbluth said that the tobacco trust got after Turkey and that it paid an indemnity; but, it seems, he was not sure of being able to get the indemnity every time, and consequently he planned to have the independent tobacco manufacturers to pay it in the shape of increased prices for licorice paste.

Jungbluth said that his branch of the trust had no agreement with the John D. Lewis factory in Providence since 1905, and that he did not at present know what Lewis was doing. He was forced to admit that the American Tobacco Company was the real financial backer of the McAndrews & Forbes Company, and that it often advanced the licorice company a million and a million and a half dollars, swelling its capital up to a total of five or six million dollars. The witness explained that the chief reason why contracts were given out, when asked by tobacco-trust counsel, was to avoid competition in acquiring the licorice root on the other side of the ocean. He admitted when he went on the stand Monday that the McAndrews & Forbes Company own a number of factories, and that it owned and controlled the J. S. Young Company, of Baltimore, Md., though that concern had a separate factory management.

He admitted that one of the factories abroad had been closed down temporarily for lack of business and that it may be closed down permanently. He stated that the McAndrews concern controlled factories in Newark, N. J.; Hampton, N. J., and Baltimore. Jungbluth was required to give statistics concerning every phase of the licorice business and he brought his own records and showed an apparent willingness to tell everything that he knew.

He was required to disclose the business arrangements of his company with the Weaver & Sterry (Limited) Corporation, of New York; John D. Lewis, of Providence; the Stamford Manufacturing Company, and the Greaves Pharmaceutical Company. Jungbluth admitted that Weaver & Sterry imported certain grades of Spanish root for his company. Jungbluth was questioned concerning the deal with the Mellor & Rittenhouse Company, and stated that the company was bought by stock.

Jungbluth was questioned concerning his prosecution by the United States Government under the Sherman law last December and January and concerning the indictment found some months before by the grand jury.

He went into great detail as regards the entire financial transactions of the McAndrews & Forbes Company, disclosed its financial condition, how much money was paid out from time to time, and was required to introduce all manner of figures concerning every phase of the licorice industry.

He testified that he had been in the licorice business since 1872; that at the outset he was the general agent for the old McAndrews & Forbes Company, in Louisville, Ky., from 1874 to 1902, and that in 1902, when the present company was organized, he became its president. He was forced to admit that the American Tobacco Company owned \$785,000 of the capital stock and about 70 per cent of the common stock; that the indebtedness of the McAndrews & Forbes Company varies from \$400,000 to \$1,500,000, and that contracts existed between it and the American Company and other tobacco trust concerns which would extend to the year 1915. He admitted that the J. S. Young Company advertised itself as independent and without tobacco trust affiliations in the trade papers, and seemed to try to create the impression that he made frantic efforts to stop it, but couldn't because Duke or somebody else wouldn't let him.

Jungbluth admitted that everything had been under the express personal direction of James B. Duke and the late Charles S. Halliwell, and that the advice of the tobacco trust officials was followed in every instance.

John Conley, jr., of the Conley Foil Company, was again recalled Monday. He was forced to recite in detail how the price of pig tin had fluctuated. He admitted that pig tin was 15 cents per pound higher than in 1900, and lead 7½ cents higher. He was forced to admit that the Lehmaier-Schwarz Company, the independent concern, had suffered a decrease in business since the Conley Company had acquired the right to do the business of the tobacco trust. He was questioned concerning the conviction of his superintendent, James Flood, who was convicted under the antitrust law for conspiring to obtain the trade secrets of the Lehmaier-Schwarz Company by means of spies who went into the Lehmaier-Schwarz factory. He admitted that James Flood was still in his employ and stated that he

had paid the fine of Flood and also of Pergoli, his confederate, out of his own pocket, and also all disbursements in the conspiracy. He stated that he did not know it was going on, however, and that he was disgusted with the whole business.

He was questioned concerning the acquirement of the Hudson Tin Foil Company and admitted that he had conducted the correspondence, and admitted also that the Conley concern held a majority of the stock in that firm. He stated that the profits accruing to the Conley company on the manufacture of tin foil was about 10 per cent.

He recited the dividends of past years, as follows: 1904, 29 per cent, 9 per cent cash and 20 script; 1905, 26 per cent in cash; 1906, 15 per cent in cash; 1907, 15 per cent in cash.

He admitted that the purchase of the Hudson Tin Foil Company by the Conley Company was concealed from the public, but tried to justify that procedure by asserting that he was afraid of sympathetic strikes.

A TOBACCO-TRUST TRICK IN CHICAGO—BELIEVED TO HAVE INSTIGATED WHOLESALE ARRESTS OF INDEPENDENT CIGAR DEALERS.

CHICAGO, January 6, 1908.

The last day of the old year was celebrated by the beginning of a crusade against penny-in-the-slot machines which throw up poker hands or colored disks, certain combinations of which entitle the holders to cigars. H. H. Van Meter, said to be a writer, represented by L. C. Whitman, an attorney, is said to be behind the crusade. Practically everyone in the loop district having a slot machine which could be construed as a game of chance was included in the complaints filed, and the result was that many prominent people who had not given much thought to the matter one way or another were cited and had to appear in the municipal court, personally or by counsel, and sign their recognizance. It is not known that Mr. Van Meter is a purist or reformer, and many are inclined to lay the blame of the wholesale prosecutions upon the tobacco trust, whose United Cigar Stores have been doing less and less business of late. As the tobacco trust's stores in Chicago have no slot machines, those independents who have been using such machines may have been thought by the United managers to have thereby had an advantage. This is the most reasonable theory advanced to account for the prosecutions.

The cases were called last Saturday morning at the Harrison street branch of the municipal court, but the prosecution was not ready for trial and the cases were continued until the last of January. It was stated that Van Meter was in Michigan.

Judge Newcomer, before whom the cases came up, seemed inclined to dismiss all the charges, as he doubted the genuineness of the motive behind the movement. He intimated that it was peculiar that anyone should have gone over the heads of the State's attorney, the mayor, and the police department to bring a wholesale prosecution in such a matter. However, he ordered the cases continued, and those accused immediately held a meeting in the squad room of the Harrison police station and began arranging for the defense.

Attorney Morris has been retained by most of the defendants. He is an authority on all such cases, and has a reputation for winning. Several of the leading cigar men, however, will be represented by their own counsel, while a number of others have joined with the majority to retain Mr. Morris. Nearly sixty slot machines were taken by the police, and those against whom complaints have been filed include many of the most prominent cigar men and liquor men in town.

P. C. Wigenhorn, a cigar broker of La Crosse, Wis., has accepted a position with Yerxa Brothers, a wholesale grocery firm in Minneapolis, Minn., and Fargo, N. Dak., to manage a cigar jobbing department, which the company has recently opened. He will continue his office in La Crosse.

The store of the United Cigar Stores branch of the tobacco trust at 81 Fifth avenue was entered by burglars a few nights ago and goods to the value of \$100 were removed.

A billiard hall and cigar stand will be installed on the second floor of a building at 71-73 Van Buren street, while a restaurant will occupy the first floor and basement.

Sol. Westerfeld, a West Side retail merchant, has been elected president of a new State organization of retail merchants, united to fight peddlers and mail-order houses and to oppose national legislation looking to the establishment of a parcels post.

The Pilsen Catering Company, of Chicago, has been incorporated, with a capital of \$2,500, to do a restaurant and liquor business. V. Bolek, R. Sedlacek, and H. Tauber are the incorporators.

The cigar store of M. Baumgartel, 93 Twenty-second street, was the scene last week of a lively revolver battle between policemen and burglars. Seventy-two shots were fired and no one was hurt, but the interior of the store was a sight to behold. The two burglars, however, were captured. The affray occurred at 1 o'clock New Year's morning. Four policemen passing found the door open and entered. They were fired on, and hunted cover behind counters and cases and returned the fire. Fifty boxes of cigars and other material had been packed up by the thieves ready for removal.

John Wardlow, president of the Ruy Lopez Company, Key West, was a Chicago visitor last week. He is well known among Chicago cigar men, but this was his first visit for three years.

Plans for a \$3,000,000 28-story hotel at La Salle and Madison streets are now well under way, and probably the work will begin within the year. The building will cost about \$2,000,000 and the furniture and equipment another million.

Shutan & Co., Chicago, have been incorporated to deal in tobacco. Their capital is \$10,000. Incorporators are E. and S. Shutan and W. Shea.

Business has been fair, with a dearth of traveling men in town.

MAXIMO.

TOBACCO TRUST AT BOTTOM OF TROUBLE.

The Society of Equity disclaims responsibility for the attacks upon person and property, as labor unions always disclaim responsibility for violence, but there is no doubt that these masked night-raiders who have destroyed crops and burned barns are carrying out the purpose of the antitrust combination. They are using violence and intimidation for the purpose of making the union of growers effective. It is an evil and lawless state of things which nothing will excuse, but it is the effect of an uprising against a monopoly which is believed to be oppressive and which exists in violation of law. When the law fails to protect any people against oppression there is great danger that they will try to protect themselves, and then there is sure to be disorder and violence and the perpetration of lawlessness upon others. The tobacco trust is at the bottom of this outbreak in Kentucky and Tennessee. (New York Journal of Commerce.)

THE TRUST IS FIGHTING HARD—ITS LAWYERS ARE OFFERING MORE AND MORE OPPOSITION AT THE SESSIONS IN THE TRIAL OF THE SUIT OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

At the resumption of the case Tuesday the first witness called was A. H. Hillman, of the A. H. Hillman Company, the well-known independent jobbing concern. Mr. Hillman answered all questions propounded in course of the cross-examination by the tobacco trust counsel, including those which he had declined to answer when on the stand some days earlier.

Mr. Hillman stated that his greatest year's business in the last five years would approximate about \$325,000, and no more. He explained that his business fluctuated greatly, because if he had a good thing and the manufacturers sold out to the tobacco trust, he would lose it.

The second witness Tuesday was George W. Coan, secretary and treasurer of the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company branch of the tobacco trust. Mr. Coan was asked to explain various letters, both incoming and outgoing, concerning the internal affairs of the Reynolds branch of the trust.

It appeared from the correspondence that the Lipfert Scales Company and the Spencer Company formed a little clique, which was directed by the Reynolds branch, and the Reynolds branch, in turn, was directed from 111 Fifth avenue.

Considerable correspondence was submitted concerning the Tawney bill which was before Congress two years ago. Many of these letters were signed by "J. Parker," of the law department of the tobacco trust. The letters ordered the Spencer and Lipfert Scales companies to oppose by all means in their power the Tawney bill, which provided for the abolition of all gift coupons in connection with tobacco products.

Some of the branch companies were not going to commit themselves either way in regard to the Tawney bill, while others were going to oppose it, but they were ordered by the trust to put up a stiff fight against the measure.

Coan testified that R. J., William, and R. M. Reynolds, D. Rich, and M. Hoffman were directors of the Reynolds branch of the trust and all were regular employees except Hoffman.

William B. Hornblower, counsel for the Imperial Tobacco Company branch of the tobacco trust, asked Coan questions tending to prove that the Imperial and Reynolds companies had no direct connection.

Coan testified that C. C. Dula and James B. Duke never attended directors' meetings of the Reynolds Company, so far as he knew. They might have done so without his knowledge.

Coan testified that the Reynolds branch of the trust was principally a plug-tobacco concern, but made some smoking tobacco. In 1900 it bought the Bond business, the Brown business, and the Hanes Company, and the growth has more than doubled since then. The manufacture of smoking tobacco was a small portion of the business in 1900, but it has grown enormously since that time.

Thomas B. Fuller, of the Golden Belt Manufacturing Company, of Durham, N. C., a company which manufactures tobacco bags and pouches, was a witness Monday. He was forced to admit that the tobacco trust owned about 93 or 94 per cent of the stock of the Golden Belt Company. He stated that he was the principal owner of the remaining six or eight shares. He asserted that practically all of his business was done with and for the tobacco trust. He asserted that he tried to get outside business by casual solicitation, which was done entirely by correspondence. It developed that the Golden Belt Company had no salesmen on the road. Mr. Fuller stated that the capitalization of this company was \$700,000.

TRUST LAWYER WANTED A WRIT.

The most interesting phase of the case Monday morning was the fact disclosed by Delancey Nicoll, of counsel for the tobacco trust, that application had been made in the United States court for a writ requiring A. H. Hillman, of the Hillman Company, to appear and produce his books and papers and answer questions concerning the volume of his business, thus showing whether it had increased or diminished since the organization of the tobacco trust.

WITNESS INFORMED OF HIS RIGHTS.

Mr. Hillman had been asked various questions last week by counsel for the trust concerning the details of his business, and he was advised by Attorney-General McReynolds that he probably had a legal right to refuse to answer. Mr. Hillman appealed to Mr. McReynolds, asking him whether it was advisable to refuse. Mr. McReynolds advised him to consult his own convenience and do as he pleased. At that juncture Counselor Nicoll asserted with great heat that he would subpoena both Hillman and the books of the Hillman Company. Judge McReynolds retorted that the trust counsel could go ahead; that the Government would argue the point. Mr. Nicoll asserted that the tobacco trust should have the same right to subpoena witnesses and papers as the Government.

"Your clients are under investigation; Mr. Hillman isn't," retorted the Government counsel.

COUNSEL IN HEATED ARGUMENT.

Counsel for both sides became involved in a heated argument over this point Monday. Ex-Judge Wallace asserted that the point would be argued and decided whether the tobacco trust had the right to subpoena witnesses and papers or not. "We don't care so much about the testimony of this man Hillman," said Judge Wallace, "but we want to find out whether we have any rights or not, or whether we are going to be blocked."

VICE-PRESIDENT HARRIS RECALLED.

The first witness on the stand Monday morning was William R. Harris, vice-president of the American Tobacco Company and chairman of the board of directors of the British-American Tobacco Company. Mr. Harris has been on the stand several times and has been questioned at great length concerning the ramifications of the two branches of the tobacco trust with which he is officially connected. The method of leaf buying, the cooperative relations, the retail, manufacturing, and jobbing end of the business abroad and at home were the subjects which provided material for Mr. Harris's examination, as well as his correspondence. The questioning by the Government counsel elicited the fact that there was always more or less of a connection between all operations and tobacco trust headquarters at 111 Fifth avenue. On cross-examination the tobacco trust counsel tried to show that there was no absolute authority over things from 111 Fifth avenue, but in this they were unsuccessful.

FIGURES ON TOBACCO CONSUMPTION.

William R. Hains, in speaking of the consumption of tobacco, said that 48,000,000 or 50,000,000 pounds of leaf were issued annually in making granulated tobacco. One-half of the leaf grown went into the smoking tobaccos and the remainder into plug and cigarettes, he said.

He also stated that about 6,000,000 pounds of Turkish leaf were imported annually by the American Company.

DUKE'S OLD FRIEND BUTLER IS CALLED.

George P. Butler, of Butler-Butler, the cigarette manufacturers, was then summoned to the stand. In answer to the first question he stated that he did not at present have any regular business. He said that he had sold the business of Butler-Butler to the tobacco trust for \$700,000. He asserted that he voluntarily suggested that a provision be incorporated in the bill of sale to the effect that he bound himself not to enter the tobacco business again during the next fifteen years. He stated that he volunteered to do this because he thought it would be the means of promoting good feeling between the tobacco trust people and himself.

TELLS OF WORK FOR TOM RYAN.

He admitted that he some years ago acquired an option upon the Liggett & Myers Company, of St. Louis, prior to its sale to the tobacco trust, and asserted that he represented a syndicate of gentlemen, namely, Gen. Samuel Thomas, Thomas F. Ryan, P. A. B. Widener, and S. A. Elkins. He stated, however, that the option only applied to the stock held by the Liggett heirs, including the stock of McCormack, Whitmore, and Halliwell, the latter the vice-president of that concern. He was asked whether the purchase later of the Liggett & Myers Company was through the option he acquired and asserted that he did not remember.

DID BUSINESS WITH PERCY HILL.

He testified that Percival S. Hill was the man he did business with at No. 111 Fifth avenue, when he sold the cigarette, little cigar, and tobacco business of Butler-Butler to the tobacco trust. He claimed that Butler-Butler was absolutely independent of the tobacco trust until its purchase. He said that he was not a practical tobacco man, but he thought himself a practical sales manager.

Butler stated that he purchased stock of the Henry Clay & Bock Company for a syndicate of men in London.

He then described the establishment, financing, bankruptcy, and sale of the Universal Tobacco Company.

Butler then told of the different brands of cigarettes, little cigars, and tobaccos which Butler-Butler made. He was asked who his competitors were on the various brands, and he stated that the tobacco trust was—that is, of course, before his firm was sold out to the trust.

BIG OUTPUT OF TURKISH CIGARETTES.

He stated that the tobacco trust was his greatest competitor on Turkish cigarettes, with the exception of the 15-cent Turkish cigarette, and, in his opinion, Schinast Brothers were the largest manufacturers of 15-cent Turkish cigarettes in the United States.

In response to the query of counsel as to who the competitors of Butler-Butler were on the Virginia cigarette, Mr. Butler stated that there was "a new man" who was growing with a Virginia cigarette.

COMING FACTOR IN CIGARETTE WORLD.

He said that he meant Frank D. Ware, of the Ware-Kramer Tobacco Company, manufacturers of White Rolls cigarettes. Mr. Butler said that the Ware-Kramer Company of late had been "mighty industrious."

At the termination of Tuesday's hearing in the Government suit against the tobacco trust, an adjournment was taken until Friday morning at 10 o'clock, unless unforeseen contingencies arise, then the case may be postponed until next week. William B. Hornblower, just prior to the adjournment Tuesday, requested that he be allowed to make a statement, which he wished incorporated in the record. He stated that as counsel for the Imperial Tobacco Company branch of the tobacco trust, he might advise his client not to produce the correspondence of W. C. Reed, the former general agent for the Imperial branch at Richmond, on the ground that it was a British corporation and that the authority to deliver the correspondence over should come from a resolution of the board of directors in England, or from the chief managing officer. Lawyer Hornblower stated, however, that he had an associate counsel for the Imperial branch of the trust at Richmond and he would confer with him respecting the course he would pursue. Special Attorney-General McReynolds stated that he would subpoena E. S. Carlton, the present general agent of the Imperial branch of the tobacco trust at Richmond, who succeeded Reed, and insist upon the production of the correspondence.

DAVID A. SCHULTE ON THE STAND.

The first witness at the resumption of the Government case Thursday morning was David A. Schulte, executive head of the A. Schulte stores. Mr. Schulte proved to be an exceptionally fine witness and his cross-examination by S. M. Stroock, of the law firm of Stroock & Stroock, counsel for the United Cigar Stores branch of the tobacco trust, was decidedly barren of benefit to the trust.

Mr. Schulte was asked concerning the length of his experience in the cigar business and replied fifteen years. Special Attorney-General McReynolds then questioned Mr. Schulte about all the ramifications of the retail business. In reply to the questions of the Government counsel concerning the effect of the operations of the United Cigar Stores Company upon the retail dealers, Mr. Schulte stated that he believed that the average retail dealer will eventually be driven out of business. He believed that his personal salvation lay in the fact that he had built up business on his own private brands and that people, in order to get his brands, which they liked because of their exceptionally good quality, returned to his stores and became regular customers. He stated that he did not handle tobacco trust cigars except when customers specially called for them, in which rare instances he furnished them.

Mr. Schulte testified that a man now has to own more stores than before the invasion of the United Stores Company, and that his profits had been reduced from 28 to 30 per cent to less than 15 per cent, owing to the cutthroat policy of the United Stores. He said that there was no doubt in his mind but that the United Stores were striving to monopolize the retail business of New York, and that he thought that all but a few independent dealers would eventually be forced to the wall. He testified that a great many small dealers had already been driven out of business. He said that he believed that about all the prominent jobbers in New York prior to the formation of the Metropolitan Tobacco Company had been forced out of business.

Mr. Schulte admitted that it was imperative that he handle tobacco trust cigarettes, as the trust had a considerable grip upon that commodity.

TENDENCY TO DRIVE OUT INDEPENDENTS.

"The inevitable tendency is to run the ordinary retailer out of business. If we were not doing business on our own brands of cigars we would be out of business now," said Mr. Schulte. "Several years we made a gross profit of 28 to 30 per cent; to-day on the tobacco trust goods it would be considerably under 15 per cent."

TRUST'S RETAIL STORES GROWING STRONGER.

"I think that without doubt the United Stores under their present policy will get stronger," continued Mr. Schulte, and he went on to explain that the 5 per cent inside granted by the tobacco trust enabled a profit of 10 per cent, where the independent retailer without that special privilege was able to make only 5 or 6 per cent.

"What percentage of the business in the Schulte stores consists of tobacco?" asked Judge McReynolds.

THE INIQUITOUS COUPON SYSTEM.

"Very little," replied Mr. Schulte. "Buyers of trust tobacco go to the United Stores and get the trust tobacco so that they can get the coupon. We get some business in tobacco on our own private brands."

"Have you any idea as to the effect in other cities of the operations of the United Cigar Stores?" asked Judge McReynolds.

"No; but I have no reason to think that it is any different from that in this city," responded Mr. Schulte.

DISAPPEARANCE OF THE JOBBER.

"How about cigarettes, smoking tobacco, and plug tobacco? Has there been any change in the jobbing of these since the advent of the tobacco trust among independent and separate jobbers located in New York City?"

"They have become less and less. The Metropolitan Tobacco Company now does about all the jobbing business."

"What percentage of the Schulte business is cigars?"

"I think our cigar business would be 80 per cent."

"What percentage of that 20 per cent remaining is Turkish cigarettes?"

"About 7 per cent."

"What percentage is smoking tobacco?"

"Very small, 2 or 3 per cent, possibly. The large part of the balance of my business is on little cigars. I am interested in a stock company which makes little cigars."

SCHULTE UNDER CROSS-EXAMINATION.

Upon cross-examination by Counselor Stroock, Mr. Schulte testified that he was interested in B. G. Davis & Co., a concern which makes some of his private brands of cigars, while I. Lewis & Co., of Newark, N. J., made his Schulte Generals; and the Falk Tobacco Company made his private brands in both tobacco and cigarettes. Mr. Schulte stated that he owned 50 per cent of the Davis Company and Mr. Davis the other 50 per cent.

SCHULTE TELLS OF HIS PLANS.

Mr. Schulte stated that he intended opening a store in Brooklyn, a new one in New York, at Duane and Center streets, also five stands in the Hudson Terminal buildings.

"Have you in contemplation the opening in other cities outside of New York?"

"Yes; Newark, but not seriously."

"Your business has been a very prosperous one, has it not, Mr. Schulte?"

SCHULTE BESTS TRUST LAWYER.

At this juncture Lawyer Stroock and Mr. Schulte engaged in some hot repartee. The tobacco trust lawyer tried to show that the Schulte stores had branched out since the advent of the United Stores and asked if that was not the fact.

"Yes," said Mr. Schulte, "but I am the exception."

"Do you know that there are more chain-store owners in New York to-day than ever before?" asked Stroock.

"Yes; but that does not make up for the independent dealers who have been driven out of business."

THE CORTLANDT STREET CORNER.

Stroock then asked about the cigar store at the corner of Cortlandt street and Broadway. "You knew that the United Company paid \$9,500 a year for that store in the beginning, didn't you, Mr. Schulte?"

"I was told so."

"And didn't you come along and offer \$16,500 for it and oust the United?"

"No; the real estate agent asked me if I would pay \$16,500 for it, and I accepted."

"You held that lease three years, didn't you?"

"I think not; there was a contingent clause in the lease, but I think I gave up the store after two years."

STANDS IN THE TERMINAL BUILDING.

Stroock then asked about the Terminal buildings. "You have the exclusive right to sell cigars in those Terminal buildings?"

"No."

"How is that?"

"A club, a restaurant, or a café can sell cigars."

"Now, you have control of a large piece of property on Nassau street; you leased the building and put the United out, didn't you?"

"Yes; do you want to know how I did it?" Mr. Schulte intimated that he could accomplish the same things in real estate that the United could because he had the capital.

"You are a pretty good business man, aren't you, Mr. Schulte?"

"Oh, I wouldn't say that. If we can't make money on cigars, we'll make it on real estate."

"Your business has been pretty prosperous, hasn't it?"

"Oh, we've done pretty well, but we are the exception."

Another Thursday witness was A. H. Hillman of the A. H. Hillman Company, the well-known jobbers of independent goods, whose establishment is located at 435 and 437 Pearl street, New York. Mr. Hillman stated that he had been in the jobbing business over twenty years. He said that the Hillman Company was a corporation and that there were three stockholders in it besides himself. The Hillman Company, he stated, had been a corporation for the last five years, and before that it was a partnership under the firm name of Noyles & Hillman.

President Hillman estimated that there were about ten small jobbers in New York to-day. When asked as to the volume of business his company transacted he stated that it would go up to a certain point; then they would lose some profitable brand, owing to its being acquired by the tobacco trust, then the business of his company would drop again.

When asked if his company handled tobacco trust goods, Hillman said "No," and added that he did not want to do business for love. Mr. Hillman stated that he was supposed to get an inside price from the Butler-Butler branch of the tobacco trust, but asserted that he believed that he was getting no more than any other jobber and that he believed that the Butler representative was throwing a bluff.

President Hillman testified that he got inside prices from R. S. Sullivan, the manufacturer of the well-known 7-20-4 cigar and other

brands; that he also got an inside price on Tellenettes from the Allen Tobacco Company; but those were about all the advantages he did get and 40 per cent of the cigar business he transacted was on Sullivan's brands. He said that he no longer made a specialty of Pail Mall cigarettes, made by Butler-Butler, as that concern had gone over to the tobacco trust.

He stated that Benjamin Hart, J. Lister, Albert Hillman, and himself owned stock in the Hillman company.

The tobacco trust counsel asked Mr. Hillman whether his total volume of business had not increased since the advent of the trust.

Hillman responded that his volume of business could not be estimated. Counsel for the tobacco trust tried to draw out Mr. Hillman. Special Attorney-General McReynolds advised Mr. Hillman that he need not answer unless he desired.

LICORICE CASES ADVANCED.

The motion to advance the cases of the McAndrews & Forbes Company and the G. S. Young Company against the United States was granted by the United States Supreme Court Monday. The two companies are subsidiary companies of the tobacco trust and are engaged in the manufacture and sale of licorice. They were fined by the United States district court of the southern district of New York last January, under the prosecution instituted by the Government under the Sherman antitrust law, and the companies are now appealing from the conviction.

SUIT AGAINST SNUFF DISTRIBUTORS.

[Special to Tobacco.]

JACKSON, MISS., January 13, 1908.

The most important antitrust suit in the legal history of the State will be called for argument before Chancellor Lyell during the term of chancery court which convened last week. The first case on the docket is that of the State of Mississippi against the American Snuff Company, the Walter Fisher Tobacco Company, of West Point, and the Carr-Williams Tobacco Company, of Jackson, in which the attorney-general seeks to oust these corporations from the State and collect penalties for violation of the antitrust laws aggregating nearly \$2,000,000.

THE TOBACCO TRUST IN PORTO RICO—LEADING INSULAR NEWSPAPER COMPLAINS OF ITS UTTER DISREGARD OF THE LAW.

The following is a translation of an editorial printed in a recent issue of the *Heraldo Español*, the leading newspaper in the Spanish language published in Porto Rico. It is in the form of a direct appeal to the President of the United States to exert his powers to put an end to the utter disregard of the law by the tobacco trust in its operations in Porto Rico. The editorial reads as follows:

"It is more than a year ago that the *Heraldo Español* initiated its campaign against the Porto Rico invasion by the tobacco trust.

"No one noticed the increasing and spreading proportions of its absorbing policy.

"On the event of the President's message, wherein he already pointed out the evil preponderance and despised methods employed by some corporations, we called attention to the fact that, while in the United States, or better say, on the Continent, these corporations were duly prosecuted and investigated by the judiciary branch of the Government, in Porto Rico they were not only breaking the law ostentatiously, but, what is more, they enjoyed to a certain extent the most open cooperation from the insular government.

"The Foraker bill, we should say the Porto Rico constitution, voted by the legislative branches of the American Government, and approved by the President, provided in one of its chapters: 'That no corporation shall be allowed to hold, control, or acquire more than 500 acres of land.'

"It is not a hidden fact that this law has been openly broken by the Porto Rico American Tobacco Company, Porto Rico Leaf Tobacco Company, or the tobacco trust, as it is called, and it would not be a very difficult task to show that even the children in Porto Rico know that said corporations own thousands of acres of land in Porto Rico.

"The aforesaid law has been especially provided for the protection of our landowners and small farmers against the voracious and unscrupulous methods used in their acquisition by the tobacco trust.

"Now that in the United States the tobacco trust and its subsidiary companies are under a civil process before the court of justice; now that even criminal prosecution has been instituted by the Attorney-General against these malefactors of any corporation that through illegal deals and questionable purchases has been entitled to, we heartily look for, with earnestness, that said processes and investigations be extended to Porto Rico, where, we venture to say, a good many things may be found, not only in the special law above pointed out, but perhaps even in the primitive purchase of that branch of the tobacco trust.

"Obvious to say that the law should be tried to be evaded, but all Porto Rico knows that these lands spoken of belong to the tobacco trust, and it will be an easy matter in a public investigation to compel the officials to acknowledge the truth.

"It is a common saying in this island that no man is more clever in his dealings than an inveterate crook.

"We had to praise the President for the energetic and active campaign against the principles of 'dishonesty in business,' in spite of the influence and obstacles brought to bear upon him, and even the financial crisis that some people—those affected by the flash of light thrown by him—want to throw the blame on him, which to any clear intelligence appear to be out of its own causes.

"Before we close this editorial here are several questions to the President:

"SIR: While you are so strenuous in your efforts to punish criminals, irrespective of their social or financial position in the States, would you forget this unfortunate island under still worse conditions, evaded through distance, and that our cries should not be heard yonder?

"The law to protect our landlord is cynically violated.

"You are trying to extirpate a social evil in your own land; would you let these dependencies, these small islands, be destroyed by the same pernicious wrong that is already injected to its very bones?

"The American people are strongly constituted economically, and nevertheless the spirit of democracy and individual liberty rebels against that evil. What would be the future of Porto Rico, at present going through a very abnormal state, politically, socially, and economically?

"The last one the most dreadful of all."

A TOBACCO TRUST MASQUERADER—JOHNSTON TIN FOIL AND METAL COMPANY, OF ST. LOUIS, FALSELY PRETEND TO BE INDEPENDENT.

In the trial of the United States Government's suit against the tobacco trust last week, John Conley, Jr., treasurer of the tin-foil branch of the tobacco trust, testified that the trust's ownership of the Johnston Tin Foil and Metal Company, of St. Louis, was kept secret, but that the only object in doing so was to prevent a strike in the St. Louis plant.

There was, so Conley claimed, a good deal of trouble between the trust and its employees in the New York tin-foil works, and they were afraid that if the employees in St. Louis learned that both concerns were under the same ownership there would be a sympathetic strike. It was implied that after all union hands had been gotten rid of in the New York plant, and wages reduced as near the starvation point as possible, then similar steps would be taken to bring the hands in the St. Louis works down to a similar level, but until the troubles at the New York end were disposed of, they wanted to keep things running smoothly in the western plant.

But independent tobacco manufacturers, and others in a position to know, say that not only was the matter kept secret from the employees in the tobacco trust's western tin-foil works, but that the independent trade was given to understand that the Johnston Company was absolutely free from any connection of any kind with the tobacco trust. It is also said that this branch of the trust attempted to fool the independent tobacco manufacturers by sending them elaborately lithographed calendars, bearing statements in plain English to the effect that the Johnston company was not in any way connected with the trust.

WHY THE SOUTH HATES THE TRUST.

The American Tobacco Company and most of its affiliations are manned chiefly by officials hailing from the South. Its president was born, bred, and started his business career in the South, and there is hardly a Southerner living who has, by preference, given so many young men from the South a chance to become successful men in business and to accumulate fortunes as did Mr. Duke.

And yet the most violent opposition and most implacable hostility to the vast corporation created and administered by southern genius, push, and capacity manifest themselves in the South, and the prosecutions instituted against the American Tobacco Company are perhaps due more to the agitation of the southern tobacco raisers and their representatives in Congress than to any other instrumentality.

The South is generally supposed to be the most clannish section of the country, their clannishness in politics, for instance, being so thick and fast as to be positively ruinous for many of their vital interests, but in regard to its most pronounced offspring, the American Tobacco Company, the prejudicial sentiment of southern clannishness seems to have vanished into a myth.

Can any reasonable explanation be offered for such an extreme change in sentiment and surprising manifestation of irrational action? (Editorial in one of the two trade papers that are vying with each other in their efforts to please the tobacco trust.)

While the great mass of the honest, chivalrous, warm-hearted men of the South are what they are to-day, their attitude must ever be one of implacable hostility to the tobacco trust and all that it typifies.

While human nature is human nature and will assert itself the world over, Tobacco believes that there is an instinct and a tradition animating the people of the Southland that holds them truer and more steadfast to high ideals than are the people in any other section of the United States. True, there are exceptions, as to every general rule, and men have come out of the South who have been ready to trample every consideration of right and decency under their feet, so long as their lusts and passions were gratified.

But Tobacco knows that southern chivalry is something more than an empty word, and that taken as a whole the great mass of the white population of the South are honest, upright, God-fearing people, with a wholesome regard for both moral and civil law, and an inborn abhorrence of greed, corruption, and chicanery.

The chivalrous, high-minded people of the South naturally do not take kindly to such an institution as the tobacco trust, which the great southern editor, Col. Henry Watterson, has but recently characterized in the following scathing language:

"According to all available information, it has employed the tactics of the pirate, the pickpocket, and the porch climber in its efforts to crush out honest competition."

The generous, great-hearted Southerners are properly resentful when the swashbucklers of the tobacco trust say to a southern gentleman who is honestly endeavoring to start in business on his own account:

"If you start that factory, we will follow you to the gates of hell, and crush hell out of you and your new company. We will do this by fair means or foul."

The conservative, thinking people of the South can hardly fail to see a grave menace to American institutions in a combination guilty of bringing about such conditions as have been editorially summed up by the *Lexington Herald* in the following language:

"The consumers and producers of tobacco are paying each year millions of dollars upon stock which represents nothing except the capitalization of the violation of the law. * * * It has been organized and is being conducted in violation of the fundamental principles of law and equity and morals. Through its efforts to control the cigar stores, individuals have been ruined by its unfair competition; through its power to control the prices of tobacco, whole communities have been thrown into a state of lawlessness and hundreds of families put into what is practical want."

The righteous, law-abiding people of the South have no sympathy with the lawlessness of the tobacco trust, and they therefore earnestly and enthusiastically applauded their own Congressman STANLEY when, more than a year ago, he declared in the Halls of Congress:

"I rejoice that justice is at last ready to unsheath her tardy sword; that God's wrath no longer slumbers. I demand, sir, that the law as it is written be rigorously, quickly, and mercilessly enforced by fine and by imprisonment; that these haughty bandits be brought to the bar of justice; that they be clad in the loathsome garb of guilt, and, if possible, confined in 'a felon's cell—the fittest earthly type of hell.' I declare that an ordinary convict should feel like an honest man when compared with the conduct of the American Tobacco Company in the last five years."

And realizing, as they do, all that is hateful and odious that the tobacco trust embodies, the people of the Southland are doubly rejoiced that it is one of their own sons—Judge McReynolds—who is to-day bearing the brunt of the splendid fight which the United States Government is making against Duke and his associates.

TRUST'S DIRTY WORK IN CHICAGO—DUKE'S DISCIPLES SPENT NEARLY \$2,000 FOR PETTY PERSECUTION OF INDEPENDENT DEALERS.
[Special to Tobacco.]

CHICAGO, January 13, 1908.

It has been ascertained beyond a doubt that the United Cigar Stores branch of the tobacco trust caused the recent wholesale arrests of independent cigar dealers in Chicago for technical violations of the ordinance against slot machines.

It was learned that Lloyd C. Whitman, the lawyer who secured the warrants, and the six private detectives who developed the evidence, were all hired by the tobacco trust, at an expense of nearly \$2,000. Practically every independent cigar dealer in the downtown district of Chicago was subjected to this form of petty persecution, and forced to appear in court. The presiding judge recognized that the cases had not been brought through the regular State's attorney's office, and but for the temporary absence of the representative of that office attached to the court in which the cases were brought, Judge Newcomer would have summarily dismissed the complaints in each case. As it was, he continued the cases until January 30, and expressed himself most emphatically against a concern like the tobacco trust seeking to employ the machinery of his court in such a manner in an effort to cripple its business competitors.

The fact that the tobacco trust was not acting in good faith in the matter is proven by the fact that up to within about four weeks of the date when it caused the raids to be made upon the independent dealers the same kind of slot machines as those concerning which the trust's attorney complained were in operation in practically all of the Chicago stores of the tobacco trust. Indeed, the spotters hired by the trust were already at work gathering evidence concerning the slot machines in the independent stores before the devices were removed from the tobacco-trust stores.

As a few saloon keepers were raided at the same time as the independent cigar dealers, the Saloon Keepers' Protective League has passed resolutions condemning the tobacco trust, and the league members have pledged themselves to do everything in their power to discourage the distribution and sale of tobacco-trust products and the patronage of the tobacco-trust stores. All in all this latest raid by the trust seems likely to prove a good deal of a boomerang.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that it is the purpose of all the members of the committee that made up the bill to explain it at length at the close of the general debate. I say this for the reason that members of the committee may think it strange that there has been no definite explanation of the bill as to what it carries. I now yield one hour to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a matter of congratulation to the Democrats on this side of the Chamber, as well as to the Democrats throughout the country, that the joint debate between Democrats and Republicans that has been going on on this floor for several days has taken place. In many respects it has been a notable debate and will be so accepted in the future political history of the country. This debate, in my opinion, has in a most remarkable manner developed the views and position of both of the great political parties of our country upon many vital political as well as economic questions. I think it has furnished the Democrats splendid campaign material. The veil has been drawn back just enough, and the curtain has been raised sufficiently high, in my humble opinion—while I am not acting in the rôle of counseling my party—to point out plainly and with emphasis just exactly the issue upon which the Democrats should go into the coming campaign. I believe that the issue is a revision of the tariff along broad, business, common-sense lines, in the interest of the masses of the people. The tariff reform issue, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, will clarify the atmosphere for the Democrats. It will solidify the friends of Democracy throughout the entire country. It will invite great accessions from the dissatisfied and discontented ranks of the Republican party, and, in my humble judgment, will give the Democracy next November one of the grandest victories it has ever achieved. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, this issue, to my mind, is the paramount issue; it is greater in public estimation to-day—in the public mind—than the digging of the Panama Canal. It is far more important to the country than the question of "imperialism" or when freedom shall be given to the Philippine Islands. It is much greater, in my opinion, than the question of the regulation of unreasonable rates and unfair rebates and discriminations of the railroads. It is a great deal more important than the suppression of the unnamed "malefactors" that were so vigorously assailed in the President's message communicated to Congress a few days since. I say it stands preeminent over all other issues. It is one that the public will grasp. It is on the question of tariff that the Republican party is weak. With such an issue the Democratic party would go to the country on one of its great and fundamental principles. I was reading but last night that within the last eleven months of the year of 1907, up to the close of the month of November, something over \$15,000,000 of hides had been imported into this country subject to a tariff of 15 per cent under the Dingley law. During the same period quite \$20,000,000 of goatskins were imported free of duty. A brief history of this duty on hides may be of service. The record shows that under the tariff of 1842—called a protective tariff—the duty on hides was 5 per cent, and 4 per cent under the tariff of 1857, the lowest tariff since 1812.

In March, 1861, the tariff on hides was raised to 5 per cent and increased in December, 1861, to 10 per cent, and that remained unchanged until 1873, and from that date hides were on the free list until the Dingley tariff of 1897 raised the rate to 15 per cent. In a strong letter, one of the greatest commoners of our Republic, James G. Blaine, vigorously protested against the tariff on hides. He wrote as follows to Mr. McKinley:

WASHINGTON, April 10, 1890.

DEAR MR. MCKINLEY: It is a great mistake to take hides from the free list, where they have been for so many years. It is a slap in the face to the South Americans with whom we are trying to enlarge our trade. It will benefit the farmer by adding 5 to 8 per cent to the price of his children's shoes. It will yield a profit to the butcher only—the last man that needs it. The movement is injudicious from beginning to end—in every form and phase. Pray stop it before it sees light. Such movements as this for protection will protect the Republican party into a speedy retirement.

Yours, hastily,

JAMES G. BLAINE.

Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee.

Yet the Republican party holds in its greedy grasp to-day a higher duty on hides than Mr. Blaine protested against, and it is just by such instances as this that the Republican party stands discredited before the people. I am not making any complaint that the goatskins are on the free list. That is all right. I have no doubt that it vitalized and gave great energy and impulse to a great many business enterprises in the country, and added great wealth to the masses of the people, without favoring any special interest. But we all know that the 15 per cent tariff, as laid upon those raw hides, is simply and alone for the benefit of the beef trust. Nobody can question that. Our manufacturers declare that with the tax on hides removed they could make and sell shoes cheaper to our own people and at the same time increase their export trade. To make this tax more iniquitous the beef trust sells those imported hides to such foreigners as come here to buy them cheaper than to our own home people. The people of the great State of Massachusetts feel the wrong and injustice of this tax more keenly than any other section of the Union, and their Representatives on this floor have freely spoken out on the subject. It is just such instances as this, one of which I have named—and I could name many, many others—that have wrought up public opinion to such an extent that it demands to-day that the trust methods of this country shall stop—fostered and sheltered and fattened as the trusts are under the Dingley tariff law—that it shall stop now, by the action of this Congress; and there is but one way to stop it, and that way is known to all men who are frank enough to speak out. The Republicans have done a power of talking, but they are expected to act now. The people are getting down to the facts of the case. They understand that the Republican party can stop this evil, and that you can and must do it, by revising the tariff and revising it in the interests of the people and not in the interests of the trusts and combinations. [Applause.]

That is the proposition. The people are rapidly getting on to this idea, and you can not prevent them from speaking out, as they are doing all over the country. They have been a long time in "catching on." They know that the products of this country, manufactured as they are in this country by the highest and best paid and most skillful labor in the world, are carried over to foreign countries, and, after paying transportation charges, are there, practically in a free-trade market, sold cheaper than the same products of that foreign country and much cheaper than they are sold to our own people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] All this talk about surplus and about increasing the foreign trade and "occasional" sales has simply been a bubble in the air and has exploded. The people realize that, and they understand it, and they are going to act on it if they have a fairly reasonable chance in the coming November. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is an opportune time, during the progress of this joint debate that is going on, when we should refer just for a little while—not going back for many, many years—to the history of the Republican party in connection with the subject of the revision of the tariff. It is very well understood that that class of the Republican party that are called "stand-patters"—and they dictate the real policies of the party—have declared, and there is no question about this issue, and no man doubts it, and we can go to the country clearly and fully on it, without any denial being made—have declared that, whatever the conditions may be, no schedule of the Dingley tariff, 4,000 in number, however important it may be or however unimportant it may be, notwithstanding whatever demand for relief there may be or the oppression it may create, shall be touched, revised, handled, or even discussed, if they have their own way, until "after the next Presidential election, and then only by its friends." That is a clear issue that is made. It is a

clear-cut one, and can be easily understood, and is in every respect tangible. I ask what reason is there to-day to give the Republican party or its leaders credit or confidence for sincerity in that statement? Have they done anything on that subject that has led the people honestly and worthily to give them confidence?

Is not their record one of violated pledges? What I ask is the true analysis of this proposition: Do we find in its solution that the welfare of the people of the country was the objective end? No sane man can so contend. Even the leaders of the Republican party, who declare that the tariff will be revised "after the Presidential election," do not think that the country will take them seriously. Of course, they do not calculate that the Democrats may be in part power of the Government after the next Presidential election, because they say that they are "the friends" to the tariff and must do "the revising." I do not hesitate to say that these stand-pat leaders of the Republican party are the loyal "friends" to the present tariff system, upon which the great trusts of this country have fattened. They are the acknowledged "friends" to the system that is to-day plundering the masses of the people of their honest earnings; and they are engaged now in the "hide-and-seek" game of politics to extend the grinding powers of arrogant corporations and trusts by seeking to allay the fears of consumers with promises that they have so often disregarded about the revision of the tariff. The whole situation is, that these leaders do not believe that it is to the interest of the Republican party to revise the tariff at this Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

What have we here from the able and distinguished majority leader of the House, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE]? He is as much the mouthpiece of the stand-pat Republicans as is the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and in a notable correspondence in the month of March, 1906, the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress, with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCALL], what did the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] say on that subject? Listen to it:

Congress is not prepared to review the tariff schedules in that calm, judicial frame of mind so necessary to the proper preparation of the tariff act, at a time so near the coming Congressional elections.

This quotation from the letter of the gentleman from New York was in reply to a letter from the gentleman from Massachusetts:

MCCALL'S LETTER TO PAYNE.

MARCH 21, 1906.

HON. SERENO E. PAYNE,
Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PAYNE: Referring to our conversations concerning a revision of the tariff, I desire to bring to your attention, for the purpose of making clear the attitude of the Republican Members of the Massachusetts delegation, the declaration of the platform of the Massachusetts Republicans adopted by their State convention on the 6th of last October.

After announcing adherence to the policy of protection and opposition to "tariff changes tending to depress or destroy any of our industries or to lower the wages of American labor," the platform urged the Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts to "continue to press upon their party associates in Congress from other States the wisdom of a consideration of the tariff for the purpose of revision and readjustment." This declaration was at least not inconsistent with the last national Republican platform, which, referring to the tariff, declared that "rates of duty should be readjusted only when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands their alteration," and that "to a Republican Congress and a Republican President this great question can safely be intrusted."

The country voted to intrust the question to a Republican President and a Congress strongly Republican in both Houses. If revision is not to be considered at the present session, it is extremely unlikely that it will be secured during the life of the present Congress, for the next session will be so short as to suffice for little more than the passage of the appropriation bills. On behalf, therefore, of the Republican Members from Massachusetts who believe that during the nine years since the enactment of the existing duties "conditions have so changed that the public interest demands their alteration," and, who, at a meeting delegated me to make the request, I ask a consideration of the tariff by the Committee on Ways and Means with a view to its revision and readjustment.

Sincerely, yours,

S. W. MCCALL.

That is the picture held up for the people to look at. What faith will an outside honest man have in any promise made by these leaders to revise the tariff? So near what? The Presidential election? No, No! The New York statesman, the leader of the majority, said in 1906, as an excuse, "So near the Congressional election." Now, since the Congressional election excuse for not taking up the tariff schedules for revision has performed its allotted part, the distinguished majority leader, speaking for his party, told a delegation of manufacturers who visited him at the Capitol a few days since in this city of the unwisdom of even appointing a tariff commission or doing anything looking to a revision of the tariff because we are "at the heels

of a financial panic and on the eve of a Presidential campaign. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, I tell you, Mr. Chairman, I could go back a few years and present broken promises by the Republicans all along the line; but here is the mouthpiece of the Republican party on the floor of the House who is speaking.

I wish to tell the committee that, in my judgment, the kind of platform that they are going to put up at Chicago will be about this. I read it from the American Economist, published in New York, November 29, 1907. The editor is a stand-patter of the highest character, and he stands with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. What kind of a platform does he tell these gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber they have to make? Whether they obey him or not, that is the question; but his is a voice from your own side, and here it is:

Resolved, That we are opposed to any disturbance of the present tariff law until conditions have so changed that the public interest demands a change in rates of duty and until it can be shown that less injury will result than could be accomplished by such action.

This is substantially the platform that the stand-patters will adopt at Chicago, for there is no sentiment favorable to any kind of a revision in the heart of a genuine stand-patter. I will read in a moment the platform of 1904 of the Republican party; but before doing that it might be of aid in testing the sincerity of the promise to revise the tariff after the election. Nothing in the world could have brought the average stand-patter of the party to such a promise except he was coerced by public opinion—supplemented by dissatisfaction in his own ranks. There are a great number of them who are tariff revisionists and who would have gladly entered on the work of revision at the beginning of the Sixtieth Congress, and an explanation when they go back to their constituents in the coming campaign will be in order. It was that element that coerced the stand-pat leaders to make promises that in some way or the other there shall be hammered into the Chicago platform in June a promise to revise the tariff after the election.

The stand-patter of to-day believes that we should have prohibitive tariffs for all raw manufactured products possible to our country and a subsidiary for industries which can not be reached by duties, such as ship navigation. The true theory of the stand-patter is that high protection causes the manufacture of the article to become profitable; and he believes when it becomes profitable, then capital rushes in to take advantage of that fact, and this results in such competition that the price of the article would fall lower than the price of the same article abroad. But the fact is that the theory does not work out that way, and he knows it; but just as soon as the price commences coming down by reason of competition a combination to keep them up is formed and the people suffer accordingly.

The last platform of the Republican party, 1904, is as follows:

We insist upon the maintenance of the principles of protection and therefore rates of duty should be readjusted only when conditions have so changed that the public interest demands their alteration; but this work can not be safely committed to any other hands than those of the Republican party; to intrust this to the Democratic party is to invite disaster.

It seems to me that in all respects a far greater disaster than ever occurred under a Democratic Administration has befallen the country recently which can not be laid at the door of our party. I refer, of course, to the present Republican financial panic that brought the greatest financial wrecks and in which great fortunes melted and disappeared in the hot air of speculation. Stocks and securities of all kinds shrunk to worthlessness and the country stood in alarm in the fear of general bankruptcy. Well, what are the conditions? If a condition does not exist to-day that justifies a revision of the tariff, in the name of common sense when can such conditions ever be brought about? We are in the midst of the greatest financial stringency and crash that we have had for years and years. The people, catching the spirit of alarm that numbed our whole unsafe financial system, rushed on the banks and demanded their money. We all deplore its existence, but banks are still failing around us, and we would be "short" in memory if we did not recall what the strenuous Republicans used to say about 1893 when a bank failed, why it had "gone Democratic." You have had a large number of banks "going Republican" of late. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We regret it very much. A few days ago in the great State of New York the New Amsterdam National Bank and the Mechanics and Traders' Bank failed, one capitalized at \$1,000,000, with liabilities of more than \$4,000,000, the other capitalized at \$2,000,000, with \$20,000,000 of deposits, and yet we are not at the end of it. Armies of laboring people are scouring the country, looking and begging for work; soup houses are mul-

tiplying throughout the country; confidence has fled from business circles, and yet with these conditions on us the Republican party declares that all that does not justify a revision of the tariff in the interest of the people. Why, I just want to quote from a leading Republican what the conditions are. We are all advised that the Dingley tariff is the oldest tariff; that it has stood longer than any other tariff since the beginning of this Government. It has been there about eleven years, and my advice and information is that but about twenty material changes have been made during all that time. Before I read from the distinguished Republican I will read from James W. Van Cleave, president of National Association of Manufacturers, as to what he thinks about it. He is a Republican, a manufacturer, and represents the greatest manufacturing interests in this country. Listen to what he says:

Do the reactionaries realize that in 1909, when the President who will be elected this year will be inaugurated, the Dingley tariff will be twelve years old? Can any of them cite a single tariff act, from the one which President Washington signed on July 4, 1789, down to the Dingley law, which President McKinley approved in 1897, which has had such a long life without change as the present statute?

Vast changes—political, social, physical, economic—have been taking place all over the globe in the eleven years which have passed since President McKinley put his signature to the present tariff act. Apparently, however, nobody has told the stand-patters about any of these things. Or, if they have heard about them, they think they are of no particular consequence.

The invention of additional labor-saving appliances, the extension of the use of steam and electricity into new fields, the development of new products, the alteration in fashions and habits, the establishment of industries unknown a few years ago, the advent of new commodities in the markets of the world, the creation of new needs, and the opening of new markets among many peoples in various parts of the earth have made a sweeping transformation in the world's industrial system in this interval.

In the rolling years everything on the earth changes—everything except the tariff. The stand-pat reactionaries tell us that the physical and the social laws which decree changes in everything else which man utilizes or fashions, or which ministers to man's needs, must be suspended in the case of the tariff act which was passed in 1897.

The one general, universal rule of change applies to all mundane affairs except the revision of the Dingley tariff. Do you suppose that a common-sense, patriotic, intelligent people are going to accept that stuff any longer? No. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have a right to refer to a speech made by a distinguished Republican at the other end of the Capitol, to whom I referred a moment since. Listen to him on this tariff question that the stand-patters have said you can not touch; that it is too sacred to touch it until "after the election." Does anybody think that the welfare of this great country of ours had anything on earth to do with that agreement? Why, no! No man outside of an asylum would pretend to contend that that was what they were looking after. They were looking after the perpetuation and the interest of the Republican party, and they were afraid of a division in their ranks if the subject was taken up at all. Here is a great political party that has been for years in control of this Government, lacking the courage and the manhood to stand up and do what is right for the benefit of all the people, and "dodging" out of it for the sake of perpetuating their own party rule. I now read from a speech from Senator BEVERIDGE. What does he say about it?

OUR TARIFF A GENERATION OLD.

The want of classifications of our tariff is as bad as the want of facts. Nearly all our tariff classifications are more than a generation old. This is because each time the tariff has been revised the committees have taken the language of the old classifications. Not one of them is sympathetic, accurate, and up-to-date. The result is that the importer frequently does not know what classification his imports are under, and therefore what duty he must pay. The appraiser first decides this question, then the importer appeals to the General Board of Appraisers, and finally to the courts. There have been 600,000 such disputes since the present law was enacted. Decisions of the Treasury Department on the subject of the tariff fill seventeen great volumes. The decisions of the courts add many more, and remember that two-thirds of our imports are for the use of American manufacturers. This has cost importers and the Government millions of dollars; the importers many millions more. It has disturbed business which has not known what to depend upon. And the whole cost has finally fallen on the people.

And yet they say that "conditions" have not arisen which would justify them in revising the tariff. Now, we all admit that of all the great interests of this country that have been truly and greatly benefited by the tariff, this is the manufacturing interest. Now, I read from a leading manufacturer, and it does seem to me that, as a matter of fact, in talking to common-sense people, that man ought to be listened to, and not only his individual statement, but his statement as the representative of a great manufacturing association. I refer to Mr. Miles, who is president of the National Association of Implement and Vehicle Manufacturers, and my recollection now is that the amount of exports from this country in 1906—consisting of locomotives, stationary engines and machinery, of implements of agriculture and vehicles, cars, sewing machines manufactured here, and other things of that class—is

\$700,000,000, every dollar of which is sold in foreign countries cheaper than you can buy the same products here. What does he say in a letter that he wrote, and which has been quoted frequently? He says this:

When Congress gave us 45 per cent. we needing only 20 per cent, they gave us a Congressional permit, if not an invitation, to consolidate, form one great trust, and advance our prices 25 per cent, being the difference between the 20 per cent needed and the 45 per cent given. This difference would give a net annual profit to my company, only, of from \$500,000 to \$600,000, and to the industry at large a net increase in profit of sixty to seventy-five millions. If fifty millions, that would be, by the time that it passed through its immediate hands, to the agricultural consumers, approximately \$100,000,000.

Now, that is a manufacturer who had been getting the benefit of the tariff. Why does he come and bear testimony against these things? Why, it is simply this: He sees the great indignation that has been wrought in the public mind by reason of these wrongs and injustice. He believes that these wrongs have gone to such an extent that the indignation of the people will be so great that they will rise up and overthrow the Republican party, and so he is trying to get them to revise the tariff and save the Republican party. That is the only logical solution that I can make of it. And again he says, not as an individual, but as the chairman of a tariff committee of the National Association of Manufacturers, that he is alarmed about it:

Standing on this platform, about 40 per cent of all the members of our association, who have by correspondence pronounced for revision, declare in their letters that their own schedules may properly be reduced 50 per cent or more without hurt to their respective industries or to the country at large. Others name a less amount, while only a few declare for no reduction. The letters in satisfaction of this statement are on file in the office of the president of the association in St. Louis, and are known to the managing officers of the association.

But here we are, with the first session of the Sixtieth Congress, having been in session since last December, and with a solemn declaration that the "conditions" have not arisen, that they have not occurred which would justify Congress in granting relief for these great wrongs and oppressions and this injustice to the people. That is why I say let the national Democracy stand for revision of the tariff, fair, just, business-like, common sense, in the interests of the masses of the people. Let that be the Democratic slogan, and we will restore our party to power next November. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Of the reform tariff issue the Republicans are afraid. That is where they fear attack. Let "imperialism alone," let all those questions pass, and stand faithfully by fundamental Democratic tenets, excluding and rejecting all modern "isms" unknown to our creed, and invite all Democrats and friends of our party and the men who are the friends of the people, whether Republicans or Populists, to join us in this great crusade to restore our Government to the control of the people—a Government of law administered alike to all. [Loud applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I can not persuade myself that the leaders of the Republican party are ignorant of the great moral revolution that has taken place in the public mind within the last two years. They are bound to see it. Why, Mr. Chairman, have we not had revelations made to us all over this country about "swollen fortunes," "predatory wealth," and the lawlessness of the "criminal rich?" Necessarily such utterances have produced a disturbed mental condition among the people. It has produced unrest and a feeling of envy among those less fortunate than others; and if you want to analyze the conditions that we are in to-day, find the true solution of it, I put to you, Mr. Chairman, this proposition: What in the ordinary affairs of life is better calculated to produce that feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction that pervades the public mind to-day than to let a man, or a number of men, who live by the sweat of their face, year after year, sit by and see the honest earnings of their labor and the toil of their lives, taken from them and their families under the guise of law and used for the purpose of enriching others?

Do you not suppose that that is calculated in the long run to create dissatisfaction and unrest? That is what has contributed largely to the present disturbed condition of our country. The most ardent admirers of the President, in the energy and courage he has displayed in his antitrust fights, are beginning to realize the glaring inconsistency that he has persistently committed of giving protection to these destructive tariff evils, through the tariff laws, and assailing them through the Sherman antitrust law and the Elkins Act. The President's friends claim that he has won imperishable laurels in bringing about the regulation of railroads, preventing unjust charges and rebates and discriminations. This is all well enough in its way, but what comparison is there in the amount of money that the railroads unlawfully exacted from the people of the country since the maximum rate decision by the Supreme Court of the United States, in unjust rates and rebates and discriminations, and the amount forced

from the American people at the same time by many of the unjust schedules of the Dingley tariff. Yet, the President was as quiet and docile as may be when he was fully advised that only one of these mighty and trust-fattened enterprises—the steel trust—at the close of the fiscal year, the 30th of January, 1907, the net earnings of this one enterprise, favored by the tariff, were, \$164,490,945, when more than \$80,000,000 of its net earnings were due to the protection given by the Dingley tariff. This is but one item. All the rebates, discriminations, and unlawful charges of railroads for years past are insignificant as compared with these criminal extortions perpetrated on the people by the steel trust, and when you aggregate all of such trusts and the amount that each one takes in dollars and cents from the people, it would equal in value all the railroads—over 220,000 of mileage—in our whole country, aggregating a value of \$15,000,000,000. It seems that a wrong of such magnitude ought to have invited the attention of the President.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to commend a particular paragraph of the President's message, on page 4 of the pamphlet, in which the President follows a good example established by Democrats. The President, in discussing the unlawful use and abuse of the process of injunction by Federal courts, says this drastic and harsh process has been used "under the guise of property rights unwarrantably to invade the fundamental rights of the individual." The President recommends to Congress to enact a statute "that reasonable notice should be given the adverse party." This is but a fundamental principle of justice, and without notice to the adverse party—which is of itself publicity—the recent proceedings, under the inspirations of the plaintiff's attorney, of some of the Federal judges at their private chambers would continue to be the source of wrong and injustice to the individual rights of weak and helpless citizens.

I recall that the Democrats lustily contended that this proviso should be inserted in the Hepburn railway rate law, "That no injunction, interlocutory order, or decree suspending or restraining the enforcement of an order of the Commission shall be granted, except on hearing, after not less than five days' notice to the Commission." This provision, in opposition to Democratic contention, was left out of the Hepburn rate law as it passed the House, but was inserted in the Senate. I hope the President's party will promptly, during this Congress, enact the President's suggestion into a statute.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to a paragraph in the President's message, on page 5.

He says:

It is my purpose, as soon as may be, to submit some further recommendations in reference to our laws regulating labor conditions within the sphere of Federal authority.

The first paragraph in the President's message also relates to the relations of labor and capital.

Why is that brought up at this time? I can hardly say, because we are at the threshold of a great political campaign. It is common understanding that our labor organizations are not right now in love with the purposes of this Administration. Take the history of the Republican party on the subject of labor within the last six years. Why, it is a matter of record. In 1884 or 1885 the "Bureau of Labor" was created and put into the Interior Department. It stayed there a while, and then it was taken out of the Interior Department and made an independent Department, and remained such for many years. The only thing that it needed was to give it a secretary who should have a seat in the Cabinet of the President. The Democratic platform of 1900 had declared in strong terms, demanding that there should be created a Department of Labor, with a secretary in the Cabinet of the President. Did any man contend that the interest of labor was not important and vital enough to have this dignity and honor? But, sir, when we came to make the Department of Commerce and Labor, in the Fifty-seventh Congress, every Democrat on the floor of the House of Representatives stood firmly, as I recall it, against taking the independent Department of Labor and classing it as a bureau along with Fisheries and other bureaus in the Department of Commerce and Labor. Yet the Republicans did that. Why did they strip that independent Department of Labor of its prestige and its dignity? They say that they gave it the same facilities and powers as Commerce. I contend they did not. I say they struck it down, and it stands to-day classed along with Fish and Fisheries, Bureau of Standards, Steamboat Inspection Service, and other bureaus of that kind, in the Department of Commerce and Labor. Finally, when the full test came and it was put to the Republicans, there was a motion made to recommit the bill, with instructions, as follows:

Resolved, That the pending bill be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with instructions to report a bill

or bills to the House to create and establish two separate Departments, a Department of Labor and a Department of Commerce, each of the same dignity as existing Departments, and each with a Secretary in the Cabinet of the President. (RECORD, January 6, 1903.)

That motion was made by a Democrat and the RECORD shows that every Republican who voted against it, and every Democrat who voted for it. For that reason I hope that when the President sends in another message, if he is so interested in labor, just before a Presidential election, he will have in that message a recommendation that a Department of Labor will be created, and that it have a Secretary in the Cabinet of the President. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why not? In the great and mighty strife in which labor has been engaged, what man can say that it would not have been better, instead of sending for Mitchell and other labor leaders, as the President did, to have had a Secretary of Labor sitting in the Cabinet and representing the great labor interests of the country?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have something further to say about the message of the President.

It will hardly be denied by anyone that the message that the President sent to Congress is in a "class" by itself and that it is in response to the criticisms that the newspapers have freely passed upon him and the policies of his Administration. Is it considered wise to notice such criticisms in this way? Many of the recommendations made by the President in his message, if carried out by his party at once would undoubtedly be of benefit to the country. Criticism in the proper spirit and couched in proper language ought always to be invited and welcomed by a public official, it matters not how exalted his position. It especially ought to be eminently respectful and courteous when directed at the President of the United States. If criticism is otherwise than courteous and respectful it loses all effect and is properly accepted by the public in the nature of personal abuse.

I think our distinguished minority leader pointed out clearly the portions of the message that Democrats could, and did, cheerfully indorse. The message undoubtedly seeks to make the control of the trusts the paramount issue in the present campaign by ignoring the tariff, "the father of the trusts." If the President is truly sincere in the vigor and zeal for the popular rights expressed in his message, or the protection of the individual rights of the citizens against the rapacity of the trusts, why did he not recommend to his party that a guaranty be given to every American citizen the right to buy at home the products of American-manufactured articles as cheap as these products are sold in foreign countries. If that was done our trust problem would be solved. The message is a strong plea for the continuance of the Republican party in power. It really makes no direct recommendation for the relief of the burdens of the people. It is, of course, highly sensational and stamped in every word and line with the extraordinary unique and startling personality of the President. No one can for a moment doubt that the President is an expert in the "game of politics." He is a writer of great force, and his command of the English language leaves him without a rival among the noted public men of our country. As a political stroke at this juncture of political affairs the message is a masterpiece. As a practical public document for the betterment of the country it is a "falsum fulmen." As the message of a statesman it will, in the sober thought of the country, be pronounced a failure.

The highest work of a statesman is to seek to pacify the unrest and dissatisfaction of the people, when it exists as it does now, not to arouse and inflame it. If evils exist that threaten the welfare of the people, statesmanship suggests to exterminate them by the strong arm of the law. Other Presidents have been fearfully criticised in the early days of our Republic, but they did not answer their critics in a fiery message to Congress. Washington, in a letter to Benjamin Harrison, said:

If I were to be called upon to draw a picture of the times and of men from what I have seen and heard and in part know, I should in one word say that idleness, dissipation, and extravagance seems to have laid hold of most of them; that speculation, peculation, and an insatiable thirst for riches seems to have got the better of every other consideration and almost every order of men.

Jefferson wrote lugubriously to Nathaniel Bacon:

Our Government is now taking so steady a course as to show by what road it will pass to destruction—to wit, by consolidation first, and then corruption, its necessary consequence.

And it was Andrew Jackson who said:

The United States bank will yet sap the foundations of our liberty.

Yet our Republic still lives and flourishes, and it will continue to flourish just so long as the people retain the instinct and the capacity or the desire for self-government. Of course we need the work of the reformer and great good comes often from such labor, but there must be no "hysteria" in such work. It must and should be deliberate and not sensational. I believe that predatory wealth, predatory poverty, "swollen

fortunes," and the "criminal rich," together with the trusts, are evil forces abroad in our land, and they ought to be and will be controlled by the law when the true and imperishable Democratic principle of "equal rights to all and special favors to none" is handed out as a "square deal" to all alike. [Loud applause.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like to have the opinion of the gentleman from Alabama, who is a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, as to how he considers the recommendation of the President with reference to a change in the Sherman antitrust law? Does the gentleman consider that the President recommends that it be so changed as to eliminate its application to railroad combinations?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes. I understand the recommendation of the President to correct that portion of the Sherman Act which prohibits railroads from making any combinations, good or bad.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then, would not that practically put the railroads clear beyond any prohibitions in that statute?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think that the recommendation made by the President, as I understand it, is to relieve the railroads of any application of the Sherman antitrust act, as I have already stated.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then they would be turned over to the Interstate Commerce Commission entirely?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No political party ought to stay in power so long as to believe that the Government belongs to that party. That is the condition of the Republican party to-day. The Democratic party never had a better chance to win than it has in the campaign now opening. The people are ready to turn the Republicans out. No man can fairly doubt that there are easily enough Democratic voters in the Union to elect at the polls next November our Democratic nominees, but we must unite these voters by the platform we make and the candidates we place on that platform. It behooves the leaders of our party to lay down broad and plain Democratic principles. Let us present tariff reform as a fundamental principle, and that the trusts are entirely dependent on the tariff. A victory won by the national Democracy on such an issue will be a victory on principle and merits and guarantee our control of the Government in the interests of the people for years to come. [Loud applause.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, the protective-tariff system is not, as one might suppose from the many things that are said on this floor and throughout the country, a Republican contrivance. It is not even an American invention, though it was once erroneously called "the American system." In this connection the etymology of the word "tariff" is not without some interest. Tariff was so called from the old town and castle of Tarifa, on the Straits of Gibraltar, where, during the seventh century of Mohammedan rule in Spain there lived a band of Moorish pirates who exacted tribute from every vessel entering or leaving the Mediterranean Sea. Nobody contended then that this system was anything but robbery. No one then contended—not even the pirates themselves—that it rested on any other foundation save that of the strong arm and the light purse. Far be it from me, Mr. Chairman, to even intimate that the beneficiaries of our present tariff system are robbers; unlike their Moorish predecessors, they operate under the forms of law, and while no man can dispute that they are strong of arm, none will venture to assert that they are light of purse. [Laughter and applause.]

In the earlier periods of our country's history there was little difference between parties or statesmen about the tariff question. All parties and all statesmen then conceded that import duties ought to be levied for the primary and principal purpose of raising revenue for the Government, and for the secondary and entirely incidental purpose of affording "encouragement and protection" to our infant industries, at that time struggling with powerful competition from older and stronger rivals in England and throughout Europe. No party and no statesman then contended that protection ought to be continued long after these interests were no longer infantile, but grown to giant size and strength. No party or statesman then advanced the doctrine that taxation was a blessing in disguise and that the more a people were taxed the richer they grew. It has remained for latter-day Republican statesmanship to advance these wonderful contentions. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, stranger than fiction, more marvelous than romance, has been the wonderful history of American industrial development. When this Government was established we were, commercially and industrially, the weakest of the weak. To-day we are the strongest of the strong. Then we were the poorest of the poor. Now we are the richest of the rich. Then we were almost entirely an agricultural people. Now we are not only the leading agricultural, but also the leading manufac-

turing nation of earth. In the production of all of the great food staples we are easily first. In the production of silver we lead the world. We are now second, and are rapidly advancing to the first place among the nations, in the production of gold. In the production of most of the great raw materials we lead the world.

As to pig iron and steel, I invite your attention to a table taken from our Census Report on Manufactures (1905):

TABLE CCLII.—Quantity of pig iron and steel product in the world, 1903, 1895, and 1885.^a
[Thousands of tons.]

Country.	1903.		1895.		1885.	
	Pig iron.	Steel.	Pig iron.	Steel.	Pig iron.	Steel.
Total	40,381	35,835	29,300	14,600	19,340	6,210
United States	18,009	14,534	9,450	6,110	4,049	1,710
Great Britain	8,935	5,134	8,020	3,880	7,420	1,920
Germany	10,085	8,801	5,790	2,100	3,690	1,140
France	2,810	1,885	2,010	810	1,630	530
Other countries	6,512	5,531	4,030	1,640	2,560	910

^a Data for 1903 taken from the Bulletin of American Iron and Steel Association, September 15, 1905. Remainder of data from Mulhall's Dictionary of Statistics (1899).

^b Does not include direct steel castings.

As to coal, to the following table taken from the Census of 1900 (published 1902):

TABLE VI.—World's production of coal in metric tons, by countries, 1890 and 1899.

Countries.	1899.	1890.
All countries	720,220,758	511,482,074
United States	230,254,076	143,167,843
Great Britain	223,689,795	181,530,705
Germany	135,824,427	82,200,834
Austria-Hungary	38,739,000	27,501,032
France	32,353,000	26,083,118
Belgium	21,917,740	20,365,900
Russia	13,104,000	6,016,525
Japan		2,653,000
All other countries	23,823,719	11,819,907

Also, as to copper, to the following table, taken from the same report:

TABLE VIII.—World's production of copper, in long tons, 1890 and 1899.^a

	1899.	1890.
Total	463,303	272,620
Europe	92,993	79,933
North America	282,636	124,711
South America	32,730	33,980
Africa	6,490	6,570
Asia	27,560	17,972
Australasia	20,804	9,455

^a United States Geological Survey, Mineral Resources, 1900, p. 186.

Also, as to cotton, to the following table, taken from the same authority:

TABLE V.—Production of cotton, in 500-pound bales, for the United States and other countries, 1890-1891 to 1899-1900.^a

	Total.	United States.	Other countries.
1899-1900	10,612,000	9,137,000	1,475,000
1898-99	12,987,000	11,078,000	1,909,000
1897-98	12,743,000	10,890,000	1,853,000
1896-97	10,670,000	8,435,000	2,235,000
1895-96	8,901,000	6,912,000	1,989,000
1894-95	11,298,000	9,640,000	1,658,000
1893-94	9,324,000	7,136,000	2,188,000
1892-93	8,607,000	6,435,000	2,172,000
1891-92	10,552,000	8,640,000	1,912,000
1890-91	10,127,000	8,137,000	1,990,000

^a Cotton crop supplement to the Commercial and Financial Chronicle (New York), September, 1901.

Conditions for the development of our manufactures have been the most favorable on earth. Consider them for just a moment; first, the greatest and cheapest supply of raw material in the world at their very doors; second, the most intelligent and productive labor on earth literally swarming into their factories; third, heavy duties, highly protective, and in many cases prohibitory, barring foreign competition and pouring into their laps tremendous bounties from the pockets of all consumers.

Is it strange that, under these circumstances, our manufactures have contributed even more than their due proportion to the glorious advance of American industry to world primacy?

Is it not reasonable to suppose that they should at least

keep pace with the unprotected wheat grower of the West, and the bountyless cotton grower of the South in the general onward sweep of American progress? That they have more than done so is shown by the following table, taken from the Census Report of Manufactures, 1905:

TABLE CCXLV.—Per cent of increase in value of domestic exports, by groups, 1896 to 1905.

Group.	Per cent of increase.
Aggregate.....	72.8
Exports unmanufactured.....	54.8
Foodstuffs in crude condition and food animals.....	8.1
Crude materials for use in manufacturing.....	87.7
Miscellaneous—animals not for food, plants, trees, etc.....	18.4
Exports manufactured.....	87.4
Foodstuffs partly or wholly prepared.....	29.0
Manufactures for further use in manufacturing.....	174.7
Manufactures ready for consumption.....	121.2

^a Decrease.

That they have not only outstripped other industries in this country, but also their rivals throughout the world, is shown from the table I next submit, taken from the same report, it being a reproduction of the figures of Mulhall, the eminent English statistician:

TABLE IV.—Manufactures in the United States and foreign countries.

	Millions of dollars.			
	1820.	1810.	1830.	1851.
United Kingdom.....	1,411	1,883	2,808	4,233
France.....	1,168	1,605	2,002	2,900
Germany.....	900	1,481	1,995	3,357
Austria.....	511	832	1,129	1,593
Other States.....	1,654	2,516	3,455	5,236
Europe.....	5,644	8,341	11,479	17,852
United States.....	268	407	1,907	9,498
Total.....	5,912	8,808	13,386	26,850

To complete the picture I have attempted to draw, let me next submit a statement of our Census Bureau on this subject, made in 1905:

None of the great industrial nations have followed the example of the United States in attempting to measure at regular intervals the value of the manufactured products of the country, so that it is difficult to furnish figures that will indicate, by industries, the relative positions of the competing nations. It is possible, however, to obtain information which, although not official, is sufficiently reliable to supply the deficiency to some extent. Estimates published by eminent statisticians and the figures appearing annually in certain commercial papers are the principal sources of information.

In respect to the value of manufactures produced annually, the English statistician, Michael G. Mulhall, assigned the United States to fourth place in 1860, and conceded that it was first in 1894. A more recent authority, however, has expressed the belief that this lead was probably gained as early as 1885. According to the same authorities it is probable that the United Kingdom can claim second place, with Germany third, and France fourth. Germany has made greater relative progress during the past twenty-five years than either England or France, and now the products of German mills have supplanted English wares in many markets which Great Britain had previously monopolized. However, Germany has probably not yet reached the United Kingdom in the value of industrial production.

According to the English Board of Trade the exports of manufactured goods of the United Kingdom constituted from 17 to 20 per cent of the total industrial output of 1902, and upon this basis the value of manufactures of the United Kingdom for that year may be reckoned at about \$4,588,630,000, or over \$3,000,000,000 less than the net value of the manufactured products, exclusive of hand trades, of the United States in 1900, according to the census of manufactures. These figures give some indication of the supremacy that the United States has obtained in the industrial world.

Now, it would, I submit, be only reasonable to suppose and expect that our manufactures would no longer plead infancy at the bar of public opinion, and would no longer beg for protection from their ferocious foreign rivals.

But, alas, Mr. Chairman, vain is our hope, futile is our expectation. They seem to desire not only to hold fast to what they have, but also, poor industrial foundlings that they are, to continue to hold out their spoons for more of the public soup, for those of them who are not standing fast in the ranks of the "standpatters" insist that whatever tariff revision public sentiment may force shall in all cases be "along protective lines" and in many cases be upward instead of downward. More fortunate than Ponce de Leon, they seem to have discovered the fountain of eternal youth and to have plunged deep beneath its limpid waters. [Applause.]

Will they never learn the lesson taught by List, the great

German protectionist? Let me invite your attention to what List said, as far back as 1841:

Finally, history teaches us how nations which have been endowed by nature with all resources which are requisite for the attainment of the highest grade of wealth and power may and must, without on that account forfeiting the end in view, modify their systems according to the measure of their own progress; in the first stage adopting free trade with more advanced nations as a means of raising themselves from a state of barbarism and of making advances in agriculture; in the second stage, promoting the growth of manufactures, fisheries, navigation, and foreign trade by means of commercial restrictions; and in the last stage, after reaching the highest degree of wealth and power, by gradually reverting to the principle of free trade and of unrestricted competition in the home as well as in foreign markets, that so their agriculturists, manufacturers, and merchants may be preserved from indolence and stimulated to retain the supremacy which they have acquired. (Chapter X.)

He adds that Great Britain alone appeared—in his time—to have reached this final stage.

Who can dispute the fact that the United States has now arrived at the third stage described by List, and that the policy he proclaims as the true one for that stage is now the true American policy—the real "American system?" [Applause.]

THE TIN-PLATE INDUSTRY.

It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to confine myself today to generalizations, however sound. I shall take up a particular manufacturing industry that has been in recent years created and sustained by our tariff laws, and by them alone. I shall undertake to trace the origin, growth, and present condition of the industry. I will endeavor to show the effect of our protective tariff system, both upon the industry itself and upon the consuming public in the United States. I have selected for my investigation an industry that is especially adapted to these purposes, one that is a conspicuous example of both the so-called "virtues" and the undeniable vices of the protective system. I refer to the tin-plate industry. Prior to the year 1890, and indeed for some years thereafter, practically all of the tin plate consumed in this country was imported from England. Swansea, Wales, is the principal seat of the industry, and in 1890 the Welsh practically supplied the world with tin plate. Under the tariff law of 1883 we imposed a duty of 1 cent per pound on it. This was strictly a duty for revenue purposes, as we produced none of the article. For a long number of years the price that people in the United States paid was the English price plus the cost of transportation plus the duty imposed by our Government.

The duty amounted, in round figures, to about \$21 per ton (English).

The English price might rise or fall, in accordance with the laws of trade, of supply and demand of the article, of the scarcity or plenty of money, or the strength or weakness of competition, or improvement in processes of manufacture, or rise or fall in cost of raw material; but rise when it would, fall when it would, in obedience to those laws, the American price rose with it and fell with it, the cost of transportation and the American duty being added in each case, as true as the needle to the pole. Let me invite your attention to the following table of prices per ton, in England and in the United States, between the years 1888 and 1899, inclusive.^a The figures are based on the English ton as the unit:

Year.	English price f.o.b. ship.	United States duty.	Price at New York.
1888.....	\$68.85	\$21.60	\$90.20
1889.....	68.04	21.60	87.00
1890.....	73.00	21.60	95.00
1891.....	77.75	21.60	103.60
1892.....	65.61	47.52	97.20
1893.....	63.95	47.52	104.20
1894.....	59.33	47.52	83.83
1895.....	56.27	26.00	73.50
1896.....	55.26	26.00	70.00
1897.....	54.43	26.00	75.20
1898.....	53.11	32.40	82.00
1899.....	60.07	32.40	97.80

The English prices in the above table are taken from the British official report (House of Commons) on wholesale and retail prices, printed in 1903, page 35. The prices are reduced from English money to our equivalent. The American prices are those given by Mr. Reid to the Industrial Commission (the average price for each year being calculated) and can be found in volume 1 of the Reports of the Industrial Commission, page 869.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the table just given let me call your attention to several significant facts. In 1888, 1889, and in 1890 the New York price was the duty and cost of transportation and English price, all added together. Substantially that is the result, although it is not precisely that in

^a The Dingley law did not go into effect until July 24, 1897.

that year. The increase of duty carried by the McKinley Act did not go into effect until July 1, 1891. For the first half of that year, the duty imposed by the act of 1883 was in effect; for the latter half the McKinley Act was in force. I have, therefore for that year calculated the duty on the basis of a mean between the two rates. I have also adopted that plan for 1894, when the Wilson Act passed. It will be observed, further, that up to 1897 whenever English prices rose American prices also rose, and vice versa, although not always exactly together. This is true with one exception. From 1897 to 1899, inclusive, however, the reverse is uniformly true. For while the English price fell from \$54.43 in 1897 to \$53.11 in 1898, the American price rose from \$75.20 in 1897 to \$82 in 1898. While the English price rose \$6.94 per ton from 1898 to 1899, the American price rose \$15.80 from 1898 to 1899. The latter fact is, I think, especially significant in view of the organization of the American Tin-Plate Company in December, 1898, a fact upon which I shall comment later. I can not carry this comparison of English and American prices further, year by year, because I have not been able as yet to obtain the figures in that precise form, but I do wish to submit to the House and to the country certain additional evidence as to comparative prices in England and in this country.

It must be recalled that the investigation of so-called "trusts" and industrial combinations by the Industrial Commission generally, and especially of this tin-plate trust, in October, 1899, had taken place. The control by these combinations of domestic prices had caused a legislative investigation and had aroused public sentiment. It appeared then almost certain that vigorous action for the enforcement of law and, if necessary, for the enactment of stronger and more efficient laws was imminent. Even the sacred Dingley schedules might be lowered, or even destroyed altogether, unless the rapacity of these combinations was restrained by some temporary self-denial, at least. Still the Reports of the British Board of Trade in 1904 show this (vol. 1, p. 132, and vol. 2, p. 570): That in 1900 and 1901 the New York price was kept \$37 per ton higher than the English price; that in 1902 it was kept \$31 higher, and in 1903 it was kept \$25 a ton higher. In 1904, according to the testimony of witness No. 14 (name not disclosed), delivered before the British tariff commission of 1904 (par. 858), the American price was 7d. per box or £7 per ton or \$35 per ton higher than the English price; in other words, as the witness says, "the American price is kept equal to our price plus the duty." That the same thing is true today I do not hesitate to assert, in view of the proof I have already submitted.

The Republican party can never hope to make good its contention, so often made, that the price of tin plate has not been enormously increased by the McKinley and Dingley acts. It can not make good that contention by showing that since the Dingley Act went into effect the price of tin plate and of articles manufactured from it has decreased. We reply that the price has decreased not on account of the tariff, but despite it; that the real test is a comparison of prices in this country where there is a heavy duty and in England where there is no duty.

If they "point with pride," as they do in all their campaign speeches and campaign books, to the 5-cent dinner pail of the American workingman, and say that it is cheaper than ever before, our rejoinder is that the British workingman buys the same pail for three cents. [Loud applause.]

By the way, we venture to inquire, Is that famous pail still full? If so, is it full of panic soup? Does the rule still hold good, so often asserted by Republicans, that a high tariff causes prosperity and a low tariff panics? I pause for a reply. [Laughter and applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, let us now consider briefly the progress of the industry. In 1890 we imported from England, in round numbers, 300,000 tons of tin plate. We produced none. When the McKinley Act passed this industry could not, of course, spring into immediate and full-grown existence in response to the high duties imposed on the foreign product. It required time to establish and put in operation plants and factories. So substantial was the encouragement to do so, however, that as little time as possible was lost in going about it. By 1893 the imports had fallen from 300,000 tons to 215,000 tons, a decrease of 115,000 tons. During the same three-year period the domestic production has risen from nothing to 55,000 tons. By 1898 the foreign importations had sunk to 67,000 tons, and domestic production had increased to 327,000 tons. The Republicans triumphantly exclaimed: "Here is the product of our statesmanship, sprung full-grown, like Minerva from the brain of Jupiter, from the loins of protection; we have created an industry where there was none; we have given employment to thousands of American workingmen who had none, and at the

same time have actually lowered the price of tin plate and of the manufactures thereof!"

I think I have already exposed the fallacy of the last part of this claim. So far as the claim of aiding the workingman by this procedure is concerned, I will undertake to dispose of it in another part of this argument. Let me, however, in this immediate connection, say that every dollar that was paid under this system of "forcing an industry" to the comparatively few workingmen engaged in the manufacture of tin plate was wrung from the blood and sweat of millions of workingmen all over this country, in factory and on farm, in the store and in countinghouse, in every branch of industry and commerce, by reason of the higher prices that all had to pay for articles manufactured from tin plate; prices that although lower because of cheaper steel plate and improvement in processes of manufacture than they had been in this country before the increase in duty, were yet kept higher here by that increase in duty than prices were in other lands. [Applause.]

But to return to the progress of this industry. By 1898 it was established. It was full grown. It was supplying practically all of the domestic demand. The domestic price had been raised as much above the foreign price as the duty was. The time had apparently come when the product of protection incubation could at least toddle alone. We were producing in this country three-fourths as much tin as England was producing. The period had arrived, so often and so eloquently eulogized by Henry Clay and by every protectionist from his day to this, when domestic competition would relieve the long-suffering consumer and operate to lower the price. What happened? A Chicago lawyer and "promoter" named Moore—Judge William H. Moore—went down to Pittsburg, the "American Swansea" of tin-plate industry. In the South there is an old saying, "As smart as a Philadelphia lawyer," but anyone who will take the trouble to read the marvelous story of "Judge" Moore's operations as detailed by him to the Industrial Commission on October 17, 1899, will readily concede that this saying of ours ought to be changed. It ought to be hereafter "As smart as a Chicago lawyer." [Laughter and applause.]

Why did Moore go down to Pittsburg? He had already at that time "organized" the National Steel Company, spelled with an "e"; the American Steel Hoop Company, the National Biscuit Company, the Diamond Match Company, the Union Bag and Paper Company, and two others; in fact, he was an expert "organizer," for he says himself that besides these he "had had applications to organize hundreds of others from the marshes of Maine to the Pacific coast." A "committee of manufacturers" had "urgently requested" him to "take hold of the organization" of the tin-plate industry. Ungrateful manufacturers! The special and peculiar product of a system that promised relief to domestic consumers by domestic competition, they were hardly able to toddle before they were anxious to organize so as to defeat the promised competition! How did Moore set about the accomplishment of his organization? He secured options, to be discharged in cash or stock of the new company he proposed to organize, at the choice of the owners, upon twenty-seven out of the thirty-three of the mills engaged in the product of tin plate and producing 90 per cent of the entire product of this country. I get these figures from the testimony of Mr. Daniel G. Reid, president of the company that Moore organized, delivered before the Commission on October 17, 1897.

What amount of cash did Moore agree to pay on these option contracts? To use his own words, "four and a half or five millions." With a high financier like the "Judge" accuracy is not only approximated, but attained, when he can come within half a million or so of the amount he had agreed to pay. How much cash did Judge Moore really pay when he organized the company? None. He paid the owners of the twenty-seven mills stock in the new company, reserving to himself ten millions of the stock for the "cost of promotion and organization." What was the real value of the properties Moore combined? He said not over five millions; possibly not over four and a half. It could not have been more than that, for by 1900, according to the census reports, the total capital in the United States engaged in the tin-plate business was about \$6,000,000.

On this real valuation of not exceeding four and a half million dollars Judge Moore organized and chartered, in December, 1898, "the American Tin Plate Company," with an authorized capital of \$50,000,000, \$20,000,000 preferred and \$30,000,000 common stock. Of the authorized capital stock \$18,000,000 of the preferred stock and \$28,000,000 of the common stock was actually issued, a total of \$46,000,000 of capital stock. He took out the charter in the State of New Jersey, because, as he explained, "the New Jersey law is very much better for the organization of these companies; very much better." [Laughter.]

Now, although it seems to me that proof on the subject is hardly necessary, as the purpose of the "organization" is perfectly obvious, still I will offer some from the reports of the Industrial Commission. Mr. Jenks, of the Commission, asked Mr. Reid, president of the American Tin Plate Company, this question:

At the time when the American Tin Plate Company was organized, was it the presumption that if the tin plate company were organized the business would be a fairly profitable one? Were times good enough so that it seemed that the business would be a profitable one if they could get this organization through?

To that question Mr. Reid replied:

It seems so; yes. It seemed that there would be a great deal more money in the business than there had been in the past; that there would be no cutting of prices, cutting down to a losing basis.

Again, Mr. Reid admitted, in response to a question from Mr. Jenks:

It (referring to the organization of the American Tin Plate Company) was for the purpose of getting together to do away with the foolishness in making prices, and competition, I suppose, would enter into that.

Mr. William Griffiths, of Washington, Pa., an independent tin-plate manufacturer, testified that at the time this combination was formed (1898) he was making 25 per cent profit on his investment, although the prices were the lowest that had ever been, and that the purpose of the combination was to put up prices and increase the profits. He also said that prices might be lowered "if there was a change in the tariff." Mr. William Going, an independent manufacturer of Baltimore, Md., but evidently affiliated with the trust, was asked these questions by Mr. Jenks, of the Commission:

From the experience you have had with these combinations in Baltimore, what is your own opinion of that matter? Is there any special saving by combination, or did you simply make your profits of 100 per cent or less from the added ability that you had to put prices up on the consumer?

To this question Mr. Going replied:

Our idea was that by consolidation we could stop the competition.

Mr. Wm. Greer, of Newcastle, Pa., one of the district managers of the American Tin Plate Company, said:

After having considered the then condition of the tin-plate industry for some considerable time prior to the purchase of the individual mills by the American Tin Plate Company we concluded that it would be better for us, as stockholders of the individual mills, that all should become partners, each with the other. By doing this we hoped to stop the intense "cut-throat" competition, etc.

But, Mr. Chairman, why continue to pile up evidence to prove so patent a fact? The purpose of this "combination" has not only been patent always, but has been boldly and impudently admitted. This combination controlled 90 per cent of the entire American product of tin plate; it was in open, shameful, and notorious violation of the Sherman antitrust act, and yet what effort has been made during all these ten years of Republican power to vindicate the outraged law, trampled under foot so brazenly in this case? None.

Another feature of this scandalous performance ought not, Mr. Chairman, to be overlooked by the American people. "Judge" Moore New Jerseyized five millions of real value into forty-six millions of watered stock. From that day to this a 7 per cent dividend has been paid on eighteen millions of preferred stock, thirteen millions of which is nothing on earth but water—a dividend rendered possible because the trust is so strong that it controls the domestic price absolutely and is sheltered behind a tariff wall \$32 a ton high.

An ordinary person would suppose, Mr. Chairman, that "combination" and "organization" had reached its climax in this tin-plate business. But, sir, the American "promoter" is no ordinary person. After Moore finished his work in December, 1898, and looked back upon it in October, 1899, and pronounced it good, only two or three years elapsed before, in April, 1901, the whale that had been called the American Tin Plate Company was, in turn, swallowed by that billion-dollar whale called the United States Steel Corporation, a corporation also unwhipped of justice, and as one of the "constituent companies" of that monster organization it continues to levy a tax on American consumption of more than 40 per cent ad valorem on an annual production of more than \$30,000,000 in value behind the sheltering battlements of the Dingley tariff. Twelve millions a year, sir, or \$120,000,000, is a moderate estimate of what the Dingley tariff has poured into the coffers of the tin-plate trust since that wintry day in December, 1898, when, under the skillful and yet tender ministrations of "Judge" Moore, of Chicago, it first saw the New Jersey light.

THE TARIFF, THE TRUSTS, AND THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. Chairman, the industry to which I have made particular reference to-day does not present an unusual condition or a peculiar situation. The highly protective, and in many cases prohibitive, rates and schedules of the Dingley tariff have in-

vited our manufacturers to combination and consolidation; an invitation, sir, that they have been neither slow nor bashful about accepting. In his book, entitled "The Truth About the Trusts" (1904), Mr. John Moody gives a list of 7 great industrial trusts and 298 lesser industrial trusts. They have a combined capitalization of seven thousand two hundred and forty-six millions of dollars. They control a great percentage of the total domestic production, and in almost every case are strong enough to fix the home price, putting down competition with an iron hand and by the use of indefensible methods. With the home market secured by an impassable tariff wall, they have turned their attention to spectacular foreign campaigns, and are selling wire fencing to the farmers of South America cheaper than they will sell it to the farmers of Georgia. They deliver steel rail to the Joppa and Jerusalem Railroad cheaper than they will deliver it to our American railroads. They sell sewing machines to the women of London and Paris cheaper than they will sell them to the women of New York and Chicago. Our country is plastered with them from the Lakes to the Gulf and from ocean to ocean. They have cornered every market and controlled every industry. They greet the newborn infant as he sleeps in a trust-made cradle; they attend him through every stage of life, and when at last he dies he sleeps in a trust-made coffin. [Applause.]

Huge corporations spring up overnight, like Jonah's gourd, and present to the world the most dazzling, bewildering, and stupendous array of stocks and bonds that it has ever beheld. Tariff privileges and governmental favor are capitalized, water is poured in with unstinted hand, and the consuming, purchasing, long-suffering public is asked to pay dividends on the whole. Overtrading, debt loading, and wild speculation have been indulged in to an extent that the world never witnessed before; to an extent of which poor, much-abused John Law never even dreamed. The period of reaction has naturally come. Investors have begun to wonder how much of this capital is real and how much is fictitious. The President has tired of the "stand-pat" policy, bequeathed to him by Mark Hanna, and gives some evidence of a purpose to vindicate the outraged statutes. Values dropped still lower, and a panic came; a panic with cotton at 12 cents a pound, with wheat at a dollar a bushel, and with the Dingley tariff still in force! [Applause.] President Roosevelt is bitterly denounced as the panic maker and as bitterly denies it, replying to his accusers in the most remarkable message that any American President ever sent to a Congress. In his so-called "campaign against privilege," as far as it goes, and in so far as it is a real battle, instead of a sham battle, the Democratic party sympathizes most earnestly with Mr. Roosevelt and supports him most loyally. But we will be no party to a sham battle. If the knife is to be applied to the cancer, and we agree that it ought, let us cut to the cancer's heart and not merely operate around its edges. [Applause.] Why confine the treatment to the sores that are caused by impure blood? The protective tariff is the impure blood from which the trust sores have sprung. Why not purify the blood instead of being content with doing nothing but cutting out the sores, only to see them return in more aggravated form? [Applause.]

The President can never hope to appeal to thoughtful Americans as a real opponent of monopoly so long as he continues to support a tariff system from which monopoly springs as naturally and as certainly as death springs from incurable disease. [Applause.]

So long as he fights monopoly with his left hand and supports its chiefest pillar and prop with his right hand thoughtful observers can not credit a man of his splendid mentality with complete sincerity or with entire intellectual honesty.

Mr. Chairman, on this immediate point—the connection between the tariff and the trusts—I will print as a part of my remarks and at their conclusion, a very able address that was delivered on October 25, 1907, by Mr. Byron W. Holt, of the New York Reform Club, before the recent national conference on trusts and combinations held at Chicago, Ill.

PRICES.

During the course of these remarks I have already adverted to the contention that has always been made by protectionists—whether they were Whigs or Republicans—that a protective tariff would stimulate domestic production and, consequently, increase domestic competition, thereby finally removing the burden at first imposed on the consumer. I have already attempted to show how this theory has come to grief in this country, perishing at the hands of "industrial combinations." But our Republican friends have an inveterate habit of contending that prices have not been raised by high tariff duties, and they have employed great floods of eloquence, tons of campaign literature, and innumerable statistics to establish their

contention on this point. But they never undertake—because they dare not—a comparison of prices of similar articles or of prices generally between this country and a country where there is no protective tariff. They might multiply figures and pile up statistics from now until doomsday, but so long as they confine themselves to a comparison of the prices during different years in this country alone it amounts to nothing and signifies nothing. The rise and fall of prices is determined the world over by a multitude of considerations besides tariff duties.

The abundance or scarcity of money, the relative supply of and demand for a given article, the fierceness or the weakness of domestic competition, labor cost, improvement in processes of manufacture, cheap or dear raw material, are all highly important factors in the make-up of prices that must follow the inexorable laws of trade. For any, or all, of these reasons high prices might follow a low tariff, or low prices might follow a high tariff. But these laws of trade are world-wide in their application and affect all countries. Therefore the only true test of the effect of tariff duties upon prices is a comparison of prices in the "protected" country with prices in some "unprotected" country of something like the same advancement and standard of civilization. In our own case, the real test comes when American prices under our protective-tariff system are compared with prices in Great Britain, where there is no protective-tariff system. I have already shown you in the tin-plate industry that English prices are much lower than our prices. Now, let me make one or two more comparisons of that kind. From 1897, the year the Dingley tariff was enacted, to 1904, the last year that I have been able to get the official British reports from our Library, or from any source at my command, the price of clothing rose in Great Britain 4.2 per cent. As authority for that statement I refer you to the Trade Reports of the British Board of Trade, volume 2, page 53.

During the same period, from 1897 to 1904, the price of clothing rose in this country 20.6 per cent. My authority for this statement is Bulletin No. 69, Bureau of Labor (March, 1907), pages 250-251. In other words, from 1897 to 1907 clothing rose in price almost five times as rapidly in this country as it did in Great Britain. [Applause.]

Again, according to the figures given by Mr. Holt, in his admirable address that I shall print, English prices rose 35 per cent from July, 1896, to March, 1907, and during that same period American prices rose 55 per cent. [Applause.]

As Mr. Holt well says, the English appreciation of 35 per cent is the world-wide appreciation, due to the increased quantity and decreased price of gold during this period. But the American advance of 20 per cent more than the British advance is due, in large part at least, to the heavy burdens imposed on the American consumer by the higher rates of the Dingley law. [Applause.]

WAGES.

But, Mr. Chairman, the defenders of protection, although they use every effort to convince the domestic consumer that the tariff duties have not and will not increase the prices that he must pay for what he buys, are brazenly inconsistent when they appeal to the wage-earner engaged in the manufacturing industries. They tell him that but for protection he must face the competition of the "pauper labor" of Europe and Asia, and that because of the protective duties his employer is able to pay him a higher wage. How is the employer able to pay a higher wage by the tariff, I would inquire, unless it be true that the tariff enables the employer to get a higher price in the home market for his goods? So it clearly appears, when we closely consider the argument that protectionist makes to the consumer on the one hand and to the wage-earner in the factory on the other, how entirely inconsistent and discordant are the arguments advanced in support of the system. It is, I think, necessary for us to examine the higher-wage argument, for I believe that upon it alone the Republican party won its last tariff victory, the election of 1888.

In the first place, I take issue, on high moral ground, with the soundness of the very essence of the doctrine, even if the truth of the contention be conceded for the purpose of the argument, though, as a matter of fact, I do not concede it, but most emphatically dispute it.

The doctrine that by law, by special privilege, by governmental favor, this Government ought to give to any class of capitalists or laborers a special bounty that must be paid out of the pockets of all the people is paternalistic to its very marrow and socialistic to the very last degree. The wage-earner who works in a factory is no more entitled to it than the wage-earner who works on the farm. [Applause.] The manufacturer or his employee is no more entitled to a bounty than the cotton planter or the wheat grower or the cattle raiser. It is not a correct principle of government to build up a few in-

dustries at the expense of many, or a few classes of laborers at the expense of all. If a combination can be made of special interests that are so favored that is strong enough to carry the elections, it may for a time succeed, but its success can never be enduring, because it is based on principles that are un-Democratic, un-Republican, and un-American; principles against which our fathers fought in 1776; principles that are completely antagonistic to the very genius of this Government, which was founded to bestow upon all men equality in opportunity and rights. [Applause.] But our Republican friends contend that the figures and statistics show that high tariffs in general, and the Dingley tariff in particular, have resulted in an increase in the wage of the American laboring man, particularly in manufacturing industries, and in support of this proposition, upon which they have now come to mainly rely, they grow vehemently eloquent and learnedly statistical.

Let me say here that the price paid for labor, just like the price paid for anything else, depends upon innumerable considerations besides the tariff laws, and usually entirely disassociated from them. Among those considerations that are highly important factors in determining the scale of wages might be mentioned the supply of labor and the demand for it, the efficiency or nonefficiency of the labor itself, the plenty or scarcity of money. But the Republican rejoinder to this argument is that American labor is the best paid labor on earth, and here they invite instead of shun foreign comparison. We, on our side, frankly concede that in nominal money wages American labor is the best paid on earth, but we say in reply to that:

1. High tariff duties did not cause the difference. Before the Government of the United States was established, before we had any tariff, Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations* called attention to the fact that American wages were twice as high as English wages, and one of the reasons advanced by Alexander Hamilton in his *Report on Manufactures*, in 1791, for the establishment of the protective-tariff system was that wages in this country were much higher than they were in Europe. To-day, with all the "protection" afforded by your McKinley law and your Dingley law, American wages are not as much higher than English wages as they were in Adam Smith's day. The difference in 1904 was that wages in New York were 79 per cent higher than money wages in London, and wages in the United States outside of New York City were 93 per cent higher than wages in Great Britain outside of London according to the Report of the British Board of Trade.

Further, if a high tariff makes for high wages and a low tariff for low wages, why is it that in Germany, a most highly "protected" country, wages are much lower than in England where there is no "protection"? Why is it that the English "unprotected" wage is vastly higher than the French protected wage? And yet if we may believe the official figures given by the British Board of Trade in 1904 (vol. 1, p. 289), if 100 shillings be taken as the average wage paid to the English workingman in London, for the same work the French workingman in Paris only gets 86 shillings and the German workingman in Berlin only gets 57 shillings. Again, if 100 shillings be taken as the average wage received by the British laborer outside of London, then the French laborer outside of Paris only gets 63 shillings and the German laborer outside of Berlin only gets 63 shillings. So it seems that the protective tariff does not give the German laborer or the French laborer any advantage in wages over the British laborer, who has no protective tariff.

Again, on page 275 of the same volume of the Reports of the British Board of Trade, a most interesting table is given, showing the rise of wages in each of the principal commercial countries between 1881 and 1900. From this table it appears that the following has been the rate of increase in each of the countries named between those years:

	Per cent increase.
Great Britain	20.3
Germany	22.8
France	17.6
Italy	16.2
United States	13.4

From this table—and I do not apprehend that either its fairness or its accuracy can be successfully questioned, for it is both impartial and official—it would seem that in the matter of money wages our American wage-earner, even with the alleged aid of the McKinley and Dingley bills, has not advanced upward as rapidly as his brother in Germany, in Great Britain, in France, or even in poverty-stricken Italy. [Applause.]

In the next place, Mr. Chairman, we reply that the tariff has been a positive disadvantage to the American wage-earner, for it has increased the cost of living to him at much more rapid rate than his wages have risen. The figures that I have already

given on the rise of prices show an increase of 55 per cent since 1897. During that same period wages have not risen but 19.2 per cent, even according to the high estimate given by the Bureau of Labor in Bulletin No. 79, page 7 (March, 1907). What folly for the workingman to believe that the Republican party, or any other party that undertakes to create industries and fix values by law, will not take more from him with the left hand in the shape of increased prices for what he must buy than it will or can give to him with the right hand in the shape of tariff protection and increased wages for his labor.

In the third place, we reply that the American laborer does not get the highest wages on earth because of tariff favoritism, but because he earns it and is entitled to it by reason of his greater efficiency and larger productive power. Although the most highly paid nominally, yet when its productiveness and the labor cost to the employer is considered, American labor is the cheapest on earth. [Applause.]

In this connection let me call your attention to a part of the Report of the British Board of Trade on this subject (1904, vol. 1, p. 286):

At the outset it should be understood that the problem of comparing the average level of wages of the different countries is a very difficult and complex one, not only because of the defects of the data, but also because of the essential ambiguity of the problem itself.

1. We may approach the question of comparative wages from two entirely different points of view, leading to divergent, and, sometimes, even to opposite conclusions. We may either seek to compare the material well-being of the wage-earners or the wages cost of a given amount of work.

From the former point of view, we are mainly interested in the average money income of the wage-earning population, modified, of course, by differences in cost of living, but irrespective of differences in the efficiency of labor. If a bricklayer in France earns half the wages of a bricklayer in America, we should say his money wages were half as great, although, conceivably, the American might lay so many more bricks per hour that his labor might be even cheaper to his employer.

From the second point of view we are interested, not in the weekly income of the laborer, but in his wages regarded as an item in the cost of production, i. e., the wages cost of hewing a ton of coal, spinning a pound of yarn, or laying a hundred bricks, of course under identical conditions.

How entirely divergent are the above two methods of comparison will be realized from the fact that competent American economists are of the opinion that in the United States the average "labor cost" of a given volume of production is at least as low in Europe, if not lower, while the average income of the working classes is certainly higher in America than in any European country. However this may be, it is clear that the real cost of labor varies much less from country to country than the level of weekly wages or of yearly earnings, and that a high labor cost is compatible with low wages, and vice versa, owing to the variations in the efficiency of labor.

I invite your attention also to the following statement as to the relative productive capacity of the British and American laborer, from our Census Report on Manufactures (1902), part 1, page lxi:

He (Mulhall) estimated £107, or about \$500, for Great Britain in 1894 and £270, or about \$1,300, for the United States, the latter being nearly three times the English average. In 1900, the census shows an average product per wage-earner of \$2,450, nearly five times Mr. Mulhall's estimate for Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, whatever proportion of the wealth created by the union of capital and labor falls to the American wage-earner comes to him by reason of no tariff favoritism, of no Republican bounty. [Applause.] It comes to him, whether it be great or small, a fair or an unfair proportion of the wealth he has helped to create, as the reward of his sweat and toil, of his brain and brawn. He never gets more than his fair share, oftener he gets less, and to teach him that for what he does get he ought to be largely thankful to the Republican party and to the Dingley tariff is so monstrous a heresy that I have often wondered if any sensible, thoughtful, American workingman could really be deceived by it. It is a heresy, unfounded in truth, insulting to his manhood, and destructive to his self-respect.

The American workingman leads the world, sir, to-day, just as he has done for more than one hundred years, in efficiency and productive capacity. He is in no sense an object of charity and in no way requires a governmental subsidy to enable him to make his living. "In the sweat of his brow" doth he "eat bread," and for that bread he is beholden to no tariff, to no political party.

Mr. Chairman, now that the party in power has decided that it will follow the Roosevelt doctrine and "revise the tariff after the election," instead of the Cannon doctrine that it ought to be revised when we no longer have prosperity, many thoughtless persons are exclaiming that there will be no great difference between the parties on this great question; that both will be "for tariff revision." Ah, sir, but what kind of revision?

In deference to an ever-growing, not-to-be-denied public sentiment the Republican party will promise tariff revision; but tariff revision, if we may believe the general chorus their leaders are all shouting, along strictly protective lines.

The tariff revision for which the Democratic party will stand is, so far as I may venture to speak for it, a very different kind of revision. A revision, not in the interest of the protected classes and of the mighty monopolies, but a revision in the in-

terest of the great body of the people, the consumers of this land; a revision along the lines laid down by the brilliant Robert J. Walker; a revision by wiping from the statute books that conglomerate mass of class legislation known as the "Dingley law," and substituting therefor a tariff for revenue only, levied upon the luxuries rather than the necessities of life.

If this issue between the parties be clearly and distinctly raised, so clearly and distinctly that there can be no hair-splitting about the meaning of words and phrases, so clearly and distinctly that the two opposite systems will stand out against one another in bold and startling relief, and the people can choose between the two, I am absolutely confident of Democratic success next November. [Applause.] On such an issue the party can and will win; far better, sir, it will deserve to win. [Long applause on the Democratic side.]

APPENDIX.

Address of Mr. Byron W. Holt, of the Reform Club, at the National Conference on Trusts and Combinations, at Chicago, Ill., October 22-25, 1907.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the tariff the mother of trusts? No; monopoly is. Is the tariff a mother of trusts? Yes; a most prolific mother. Besides, it is a foster mother of nearly all of the trusts of which it is not the real mother. The home-market monopoly, created by our present outrageously high Dingley tariff, has clearly given birth to and nourished and protected more vicious and monstrous trusts than have all other forms of monopoly in this country. The world never before saw so many huge, thieving, preying combinations as are now with us. The arguments and evidence in support of these statements are so strong and overwhelming that it ought not to be necessary to repeat them to an intelligent audience. I shall briefly enumerate some of them:

PROTECTION INVITES TRUSTS.

1. A protective tariff tends to restrict competition to the country protected. It stands to reason that it is easier to form a national than an international, or world, trust.

2. Protected countries have many trusts; free-trade countries virtually none.

3. The number, size, and effectiveness of trusts in different countries varies, roughly, with the amount of protection afforded by tariff duties.

4. The era of trusts began in this country with the passage of the Dingley bill—the culmination of protection run mad.

5. No trust of consequence was formed under the relatively low protective tariff act called the "Wilson bill."

The first proposition is axiomatic. It is clear that a tariff which keeps out foreign goods, and thus restricts the field of competition, not only invites, encourages, and promotes the formation of industrial combinations, but fosters and protects them, after they are formed, and aids them in controlling prices. The smaller the territory circumscribed by a tariff wall the more likely it is that the competitors in an industry, inside this wall, will get together to control production and prices, within the wall, however free they leave themselves to cut prices in outside territory.

Fortunately for us, we do not have tariff walls around States, counties, or cities. The rates of duty of the Dingley bill would be unbearable and would not be tolerated by the most patient people on earth, if applied to a very small country or to a single State. Under such conditions our States would be overrun with trusts even more than they now are, and the sum total of the tariff graft, instead of being \$1,500,000,000 a year, as now, would be two or three times as much. However, this country would not have attained its present great population and wealth had each of our States been surrounded by Dingley tariff walls. Its prosperity is largely due to the fact that, considering its internal commerce, it is the greatest free-trade country on earth.

The second and third propositions are based on facts. Unquestionably there are more and stronger trusts in protected than in free-trade countries; in countries of high than in those of moderate protective duties.

Congressman LITTLEFIELD, of Maine, a staunch Republican and protectionist, published, in 1903, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a list of 793 trusts with a total capitalization of \$14,000,000,000. Of these trusts 435, with over \$9,000,000,000 of capital, were industrial combinations. Nothing like this number of trusts has ever been found in any other country.

BUT FEW TRUSTS IN ENGLAND.

The Industrial Commission, a Republican partisan protectionist body of the most pronounced type, sent Prof. J. W. Jenks to Europe to find as many trusts there as possible. He found 35 so-called "trusts" in England, with a total capital of \$460,000,000, or less than one-third that of our pet steel trust. He quoted tables from Liefman's book showing that there had been 345 trusts in Germany, and that from 230 to 250 were in existence there in 1897. He stated that "in England the movement toward combination has not gone so far as in either Austria or Germany"—both highly protected countries. He stated that the English trusts have but little water in their capitalization as compared with American trusts; that the English trusts have had little or no effect in advancing prices, and that the (then) recent slight advance in prices was "due in good part to the increase in the prices of the raw materials." In Germany he found that many of the trusts, taking advantage of the high tariff duties, had advanced prices very much. This was particularly true of the iron and steel trusts and of the sugar trust, or cartel, both of which pattern after our much larger trusts and sell goods for export much below the home prices.

Other writers find even fewer trusts in England than did Professor Jenks. Mr. Wilhelm Berdrow, a German economist, says in the May, 1899, Forum:

"As far as England is concerned, it must be admitted that the trust system has as yet found but tardy acceptance in that country. This is doubtless due in some degree to the thorough appreciation of the principle of free trade; for it is well known that the largest trusts are powerless unless their interests are secured by a protective tariff excluding from the whole market the product of foreign countries."

Mr. Thomas Scanlon, of Liverpool, writing of trusts in England, said: "It can not be said that we suffer in any appreciable degree from combinations of producers to keep up prices."

These and other authorities virtually agree that, instead of the price-raising, Congress-controlling, law-defying, bulldozing, and all-powerful tariff monsters with which we are familiar in this country, the so-called "trusts" of England are really only harmless syndicates, with little or

no control over prices. They exist not because they have any monopoly, but because production can be carried on more economically on a large than on a small scale. If they attempt to control prices, as did the recently formed soap trust, they commit what, in England, is regarded as the unpardonable sin. The soap trust endured but a few short weeks. A really free people would not stand, for one month, the robbery of any one of our scores of plundering tariff trusts.

The testimony is overwhelming that trusts do not flourish in free-trade England as they do in protected Austria, Germany, and the United States. Nowhere, outside of the Republican Campaign Book and of the organs of protection, published by the organizations supported by the protected interests, is it even pretended that England has trusts comparable to those in this country. These organs brazenly disregard and defy all known facts. Thus the Republican Text-Book of 1900 said: "England has no tariff, and trusts exist and flourish in free-trade England—trusts more monstrous than any that we know anything about."

These monstrous trusts, it was said, "are solely, thoroughly, and absolutely the product of the Cobdenite free trade."

The American Economist, organ of the Protective Tariff League, on October 18, 1907, says:

"Former Governor Douglas says the only way to save this country from the trusts is to cut down the tariff. Douglas would have a terrible time telling the British people how they were to get out of the clutches of the trusts. They are in the clutches more than the people of the United States, and they have no tariff to cut down."

I hesitate to say that the writers of these statements knew them to be false and that they deliberately distort and falsify facts and figures in order to deceive the voters and to prolong our accursed tariff system. I prefer to credit such misrepresentations to the overzealous efforts of protection fanatics who honestly believe that foreign trade and commerce is a curse and who would like to see each country surrounded by walls of fire.

DINGLEY BILL USHERED IN ERA OF TRUSTS.

While the truth of proposition four is well established by facts, it is also true that a few of our important trusts were formed under the auspices of the McKinley bill of 1890; three or four even antedating 1890.

Census Bulletin No. 22, issued, I believe, in 1900, contained information concerning 183 "industrial combinations," as they were modestly called, with a total authorized capital of \$3,607,539,200. Of these 183 trusts, 7 were formed in 1897, 20 in 1898, 79 in 1899, and 13 in 1900 prior to June 30. Nearly two-thirds of these trusts were, therefore, formed in the three years following the passage of the Dingley Act.

Mr. John Moody's *The Truth About the Trusts* was published in March, 1904. It contains a list of 318 important active industrial trusts with a total outstanding capital of \$7,246,342,533. Of these 318 trusts, 236, with a capitalization of \$6,049,618,223, were formed since January, 1898. It thus appears that about three-fourths of the important trusts in 1904 were formed since the passage of the Dingley bill and that the capitalization of these trusts was more than five-sixths of the total capitalization of all trusts.

NO IMPORTANT TRUSTS UNDER WILSON BILL.

Only fourteen of these trusts were formed while the Wilson bill was in force. Of these fourteen, two were formed before and were only reorganized during the Wilson bill period. One, the Borax Consolidated (Limited), was incorporated in England, and was the outgrowth of a most obnoxious American trust, born in 1890, I believe. Another, the Consolidated Lake Superior Company, was named in 1897, but did not really become a trust until 1901. There were, then, really but ten trusts, with a total capital of only \$108,150,000, that can properly be credited to the Wilson bill period. Of these ten trusts The Virginia-Carolina Chemical Company, capitalized at \$57,000,000, has since been reorganized. The remaining nine, having a capitalization of only \$51,150,000, include several patent combinations and the Pure Oil Company, one of the most successful competitors of the Standard Oil Company.

The Wilson bill, then, was not the mother of a single successful trust of any consequence. This is a rather remarkable fact when it is considered that the Wilson bill rates were only slightly lower than those of the McKinley and Dingley bills. Its duties were, however, much less protective than those of the other bills. From these facts we may infer that moderate protection will not give birth to many important trusts and that inordinate protection is necessary to overcome the natural tendency of individual manufacturers to hang on to the businesses which they have built up. These facts are also suggestive to some of our mighty statesmen who are vainly trying to "bust" trusts by court proceedings, and without taking away from them the special tariff privilege which nourishes and sustains them. It is as if our nation should try to prevent drunkenness and its many evils by legislative enactments, while maintaining public saloons for the free distribution of whiskey and other alcoholic drinks.

It being, then, established that our Dingley tariff breeds trusts as naturally as a tropical swamp breeds mosquitoes, we are ready to consider another phase of the tariff-trust question.

TARIFFS, TRUSTS, AND PRICES.

Not only did the Dingley Act usher in an era of trusts, but it also ushered in an era of high prices. Professedly, a trust is formed to reduce the cost of production and to establish and maintain fair and stable prices. Actually, most trusts are formed to create a monopoly, to put prices as high as possible, to reduce wages, and, in general, to make profits.

The trust promoters "got busy" almost before the Dingley bill was signed by President McKinley. They made hay while the tariff sun was shining; they are still in the harvest field, though the hay is nearly all garnered—nearly every article of necessity, except farm products, being the product of some protected trust that fixes prices at the maximum profit point. The trusts lost no time in elevating prices—some 25 per cent, some 50 per cent, and some 100 per cent. The price of wire nails was yanked up from \$1.40 per keg in July, 1898, to \$2.45 in July, 1899, and to \$3.30 in January, 1900. The price of barb wire was pulled up from \$1.80 per hundred pounds in July, 1898, to \$3.30 in July, 1899, and to \$4.13 in January, 1900. It having become evident to the presiding genius then at the head of the American Steel and Wire Company that prices were so high that they were checking consumption, he promptly and precipitately lowered prices of wire and nails one cent a pound. The price of tin plate was lifted from \$2.85 per hundred pounds in July, 1898, to \$4.05 in July, 1899, and to \$4.84 in January, 1900. The price of steel beams was raised from \$1.20 in 1897, to \$2.40 in 1900. The price of plate glass rose 150 per cent from 1897 to 1900. The price of window glass was shoved up from \$1.75 in April, 1897, to \$4.80 in April, 1901. Similar advances were made in the prices of most of the other iron and steel products, lead, borax, and of many other articles.

Since 1897, and especially since 1899, the prices of trust products have been maintained at extremely high points. Because of excellent crops, sold at good prices, this country has been prosperous since 1897. But the protected trusts have skimmed the cream of our prosperity and have left only the skimmed milk for workmen and farmers. Money wages have risen, but tardily and slowly, and only about half as much as has the cost of living. The prices of farm products, until this year, had risen less than had the prices of most manufactured goods.

The average rise of prices is best shown by Dun's Index numbers. These include the prices of 350 commodities and give each a weight in accordance with its importance in consumption. On July 1, 1897, Dun's index number was 72,455; on March 1, 1907, it was 109,913, showing an advance in average prices since 1897 of 51.7 per cent. By April 1, 1907, there had been a decline of about 2 per cent. For some reason Dun's figures, which until then had been published regularly for thirty years, have not been published since April. It will be recalled that, because of the cold spring, the prices of cotton, wheat, corn, oats, etc., rose rapidly during April. Possibly there was some connection between these two facts. Possibly the publication of these cost-of-living figures was "accelerating public sentiment" in the wrong direction—for the trusts. It is worth noting that one year previously the Department of Commerce and Labor, at Washington, suddenly ceased to publish Dun's tell-tale figures in its monthly reports. There was considerable of a "spread" between Dun's and the Government's figures of prices, and the spread was growing rapidly. These coincidences may have had nothing to do with the stoppage of the most scientifically constructed cost-of-living figures ever published. Regardless of economic or political consequences, we earnestly hope that Dun's Review will soon continue to give the world the benefit of its price tables.

Bradstreet's less scientifically constructed figures show an increase in wholesale prices of 50 per cent from July 1, 1898, to March 1, 1907. The figures of the Labor Bureau at Washington show that wholesale prices averaged 40.6 per cent higher in 1906 than in 1897. They show that retail prices of food averaged 15.7 per cent higher in 1906 than for the ten years from 1890 to 1899. These Government figures are very unsatisfactory and are evidently made to order. Almost any kind, and almost all kinds, of retail prices can be obtained, even on different streets of the same city. They afford excellent opportunities for trick juggling. It is fair to assume that these opportunities have been utilized. We know that the statistics of the census, so far as they relate to wages and manufactures—especially in the protected industries—are juggled so that they are almost worthless.

It is reasonably certain that the price level in this country is now between 50 per cent and 60 per cent higher than it was ten years ago. It is not pretended that all of this advance should be credited to the Dingley tariff and its brood of trusts. The Labor Bureau report of last spring suggested that "internal revenue and tariff acts have in a marked degree affected prices by helping them to move upward." This is undoubtedly true. About how much of the advance should be credited to the tariff and trusts can be learned from a comparison of our price figures with those of England, where there are no protective duties and no tariff trusts.

Sauerbeck's index numbers advanced 35.1 per cent from July, 1896, to March, 1907—from 59.2 per cent to 80 per cent. The index number of the London Economist advanced 37.6 per cent from the end of 1897 to March, 1907. Since March last it has declined rapidly and is now only 30 per cent higher than in 1897. Its figures in 1897 were 1,890, and on October 1, 1907, 2,457.

It is evident from these figures that during the last ten years prices have risen about 55 per cent in this country and 35 per cent in England. The 35 per cent advance is undoubtedly due to the depreciation of gold. A similar advance has occurred in all countries. The greater advance in this country, Canada, and Japan can fairly be credited to the higher tariffs of these countries and to the protected trusts.

AMOUNT OF TARIFF GRAFT.

To be perfectly safe, suppose we credit only 15 per cent of this rise in prices to our tariff and tariff trusts. What an awful charge against them! We probably consume about \$14,000,000,000 worth of goods in a year. Fifteen per cent of \$14,000,000,000 is \$2,100,000,000—the amount of the tariff-trust graft. Estimated in other ways, and especially by considering the tariff duties on each item and the difference between foreign and domestic prices, it appears that the tariff graft is fully \$1,500,000,000.

This graft is far greater than any possible graft from railroad rebates or overcharges, of which we have heard so much lately. It is almost equal to the total gross receipts of all of our railroads—slightly more than \$2,000,000,000. It is more than twice the net earnings of all of our railroads.

It is this tariff-trust graft that is most largely responsible for the swollen fortunes that have caused our President such grave concern. He suggests inheritance taxes to lessen somewhat the rapidity of the growth of these tariff swellings. How inconsistent! If he wants not only to stop the growth of but to reduce these obnoxious swellings why does he not try to stop the cause of the swellings? Why does he not attack the tariff walls behind which the trusts and the predatory wealth are entrenched? Are our tariff schedules sacred? Is there any other way to "bust" the trusts so that they will stay "busted," than to "bust" the tariff schedules that shelter the trusts? What does it benefit the common people to have a trust illegalized if its products are sold at higher prices after it is under the ban of our courts? If, by high tariff duties, we license the trusts to prey upon us, can we hope to stop their depredations by the warning fingers of our courts? If we turn the hogs into the garden, can we expect them to refrain from eating the good things there? Is it not clear that the real remedy for trusts is to cut the tap root from which they derive nourishment—the tariff? Is any other remedy half as easy to give or half as certain in its results?

Take the greatest of all trusts—the United States Steel Corporation. It is as clearly a trust and as clearly illegal as was the Standard Oil trust when it was declared illegal. But does anyone suppose that the steel trust would pay any more attention to court decisions—so far as prices are concerned—than did the Standard Oil trust? The tariff graft of the steel trust is between \$50,000,000 and \$100,000,000 a year. To-day it holds the keys to the tariff situation at Washington. It controls the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means and Rules Committees of the House. It lets nothing get by it in the tariff line. It is the chief of stand-patters—at \$75,000,000 a year. It will not give up its tariff keys without a desperate struggle. Those who think otherwise do not know the tariff situation at Washington and do not appreciate the power of the billion-dollar tariff-trust graft.

Other trusts have been "knocked out" by our courts, but are still doing business at the old stands and are charging higher prices than ever. Some of these are the sugar, beef, coal, pipe, and paper trusts. What do these trusts care for court decisions? In no instance have

the consumers benefited by antitrust action. Why is the farce continued? Is it to throw voters off the trail? Why not cease barking up the wrong tree? The real remedy for most trusts lies in the removal of the tariff that protects them. This action will not injure the good trusts—those that produce cheaply, sell at fair prices, and charge Americans no more than foreigners for their goods. It will, however, cure most of the evils of big industrial combinations. It will stop them from fattening on the lifeblood of the nation.

TARIFF CONTRACT VIOLATED.

It is not generally known that protective tariff laws got on our statute books through false pretenses. They were put there with an understanding, amounting to an implied contract, that they would be removed should the protected interests at any time combine to stifle competition and to put up prices above a reasonable basis. Here is what Senator John Sherman said in 1899:

"The primary object of a protective tariff is to secure the fullest competition by individuals and corporations in domestic production. If such individuals or corporations combine to advance the price of the domestic product and to prevent the free result of open and fair competition, I would, without a moment's hesitation, reduce the duties of foreign goods competing with them in order to break down the combination."

Mr. Blaine, in his Twenty Years in Congress, says:

"Protection in the perfection of its design does not invite competition from abroad, but is based on the contrary principle that competition at home will always prevent monopoly on the part of the capitalists, assure good wages to the laboring man, and defend the consumers against the evil of extortion."

Mr. Andrew Carnegie is quoted, in the American Manufacturer, of Pittsburg, under date of July 25, 1884, as saying:

"We are the creatures of the tariff, and if ever the steel manufacturers here attempt to control or have any general understanding among them the tariff would not exist one session of Congress. The theory of protection is that home competition will soon reduce the price of the product so it will yield only the usual profit; any understanding among us would simply attempt to defeat this. There never has been nor ever will be such an understanding."

Notwithstanding the statements of these eminent protectionists, the protected interests have taken full advantage of their tariff-monopoly privileges and have combined and put up prices. Moreover, the tariff has existed through several sessions of Congress since these trust conditions have been known. The protected interests have broken their contracts. Why has the tariff not been taken away from them? When will Congress do its duty? When will it protect the people in the only way that they can be protected from the protected trusts?

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and, Mr. CRUMPACKER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment, the bill (H. R. 16050) to authorize the Interstate Transfer Railway Company to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield an hour, or so much thereof as the gentleman may need, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS].

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, on the 16th of last December I introduced in this House a bill providing for a banking and currency commission, to consist of nine members to be appointed by the President, two to be residents of Eastern States, two of the Middle Western States, two of the Southern States, two of the remaining States of the Union, and one from the Republic at large. The bill provides that these commissioners shall have public hearings of not less than three days each in the cities of New York, Chicago, St. Louis, Denver, Fort Worth, New Orleans, and Atlanta, and such other places and under such rules and regulations as the commission may provide.

The bill also provides that they shall cause to be filed with the Clerk of this House, not later than the 1st of December of each year, a stenographic report of these hearings, and also their recommendations as to the revision of our banking and currency laws with reference to devising such a system as, in their judgment, is best calculated to meet the needs of our country.

I wish, as briefly as I can, to discuss to-day the reasons which actuated me in introducing that bill and which impel me now to earnestly press its adoption. In the first place, to touch the banking and currency question under present conditions is a serious undertaking, not one to be entered into hastily or unadvisedly.

The best estimates of the total wealth of this country run all the way from one hundred to one hundred and fifty billions of dollars; our annual foreign and domestic commerce exceeds twenty-six billions of dollars; the banking power of this country is seventeen billions of dollars as against twenty-seven billions of dollars for all the rest of the world; the capital invested in banks in this country to-day, including surplus and undivided profits, is something over two billions and a half of dollars, and the bank deposits in these banks is in the neighborhood of fourteen billions of dollars. The clearings of the different clearing houses in the cities of the United States, as shown by the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, were during the last fiscal year, in round

numbers, one hundred and fifty-four billions of dollars. These figures stagger the human intellect. And all of these great interests rest upon a money system of about three billions of dollars, which, in fact and in turn, rests upon gold aggregating about one billion and five hundred millions of dollars. Those who think about this question must recognize the danger of either contracting or inflating the currency of the country, and it is rather difficult to tell, dependent upon conditions, which is the more dangerous. My own opinion is that inflation is more dangerous to the whole people in the long run than contraction. This situation is intensified by the fact that perhaps no great subject before the American people involves as much ignorance as banking and currency. I undertake to confess my own ignorance of the subject, and if any of my colleagues are not ready to plead guilty to the charge I believe I will be able to prove their guilt in a cross-examination of twenty-five minutes. The people at large do not know themselves what they want in the way of banking and currency legislation. Nor does Congress know what it wants, nor do the bankers themselves know what they want. The average banker knows nothing of banking and currency as a system. He has only paid attention to existing law sufficiently to acquire knowledge of how to operate the business and keep out of the penitentiary, and make money under his banking authorization.

The prevalent idea that banking and currency as a system is generally and thoroughly understood by the bankers of the country has no foundation in fact, as they will frankly admit when you talk to them about the subject. The reason of this is obvious. We have had great agitation, politically and otherwise, in the press and on the stump about such things as coinage, silver, gold, the tariff, colonialism, and all of that, but we never have had since the civil war or the inauguration of our present banking system any widespread discussion of banking and currency as a system. We have had the Industrial Commission, we have had the Monetary Commission and the Tariff Commission, and widespread research and information poured out to the people, but no such advantage with reference to our banking and currency laws. Not only that, but this is an era of intense and divided political activity. Perhaps never in the history of this country since the civil war has there been in all parties so radical and so intense a difference upon various subjects of legislation as now.

The great party now in charge of this Government is in the struggle of its history to determine whether it shall be a reactionary or a progressive or a stand-pat medium party. Whether it shall become a Roosevelt-Taft Republican party, a Foraker-Fairbanks Republican party, or whether it shall become a Cannon-Knox medium party no man can tell, even in the Republican party itself. These differences, now rapidly disappearing, to a degree have existed among the Democratic organization. Now, what does all this have to do, you say, with this question? It has this much to do with it: No man of sense and patriotism will contend that the banking and currency system of this country ought to be dragged into the domain of partisan politics. There is no reason for it, there is no sense in it, and there is infinite injury in it to the whole people of this country. I came to Congress a very intense partisan Democrat. My own judgment is I am a better Democrat than when I came here; but I know I am far less of a partisan than when I came. And I have a firm, settled policy in my own mind to keep this question out of the domain of partisan politics, and I think if we do that the solution will be the better for the country. [Applause.] Unless some such plan as I suggest is adopted on this great subject, the one remaining great subject of so wide interest to all our 80,000,000 people, and which touches all the great progressive industries of this country, will be thrown into the vortex of Presidential, Senatorial, and Congressional politics, which will obstruct the wise solution of the questions involved in this discussion. That is a reason, in my judgment, why all men should unite in the adoption of some such plan as I propose. I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask to have read, an editorial from the Houston Post of February 1, a leading partisan Democratic paper in the State of Texas, which as a State perhaps is more interested in the emergency currency, which would affect the moving of our crops to the extent of from \$200,000,000 to \$300,000,000 a year, than any other State in the Union, and yet this paper is willing for nonpartisan purposes to take this position.

Please read, Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

MR. BURGESS'S CURRENCY COMMISSION BILL.

Representative BURGESS made an eloquent plea the other day before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in advocacy of his bill providing for the appointment of a currency commission. It is Mr. BURGESS's belief that the currency problem should be taken from the domain of party politics and that as a first step toward its solution a commission of nine men should be appointed to investigate the

great monetary systems of the world and formulate some plan that will best serve the interests of the country.

Mr. BURGESS told the committee that neither the bankers, Congress, nor the people knew enough of the currency question to justify the adoption of any plan now offered. While this is rather a strong declaration, it is undoubtedly true. The greatest divergence of opinion respecting the currency is found among the bankers. Not one Congressman in a dozen pretends to know anything about it and few of the people ever enjoy an opportunity to study its abstrusities. Under present conditions Congress will not adopt any plan whatever, not because the bills presented are without merit, but because Members are not sure that the proposed changes will improve the present currency system.

The people are likewise uncertain. They distrust the measures formulated by bankers, because they fear that the banks will be given even greater advantages than they now enjoy.

In this diversity of sentiment the prospects for relief are remote. Ultimate reform is possible only when a system is devised by men in whose wisdom and unselfishness the people and the financiers have confidence. A bill formulated by a partisan majority will never command the confidence of the country. Therefore it is essential to eliminate partisanship and create a commission that will devote the necessary time to the investigation of the problem. Otherwise, it is improbable that Congress will ever do anything in the premises.

The appointment of such a commission as Mr. BURGESS advocates will be a long step forward in the direction of reform. Its nonpartisan character, assuming that the members would be men of ability, would allay the suspicions which Congressmen and the people usually entertain toward all currency measures, and the final report would be such a presentation of all the questions involved that Congress and the country could understand them.

The very certainty that both parties will hesitate to accept any measure offered by a partisan committee makes it advisable to first lift the question above the plane of party politics. When that is done substantial progress toward currency reform can be made.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, under such a condition, the pressure is enormous to make the Senator or the Representative adjust his views of banking and currency to the local political conditions which confront him. It is useless to deny that but few men in public life are brave enough, big enough, to determine a course and unflinchingly pursue it uninfluenced by political conditions which involve their continuity in office. To assert this is to say what all of us know and feel, is to confess the truth, which is that Congress needs courage vastly more than it needs capacity. If my plan could be adopted, this great subject of vital concern to 80,000,000 of people who possess more than one hundred billions of wealth, and whose annual foreign and domestic commerce exceeds \$26,000,000,000, could be lifted out of the turmoil of partisan politics and the whole body of the people be led into a discussion of the situation, and out of such educational process a wise, nonpartisan, nonsectional, and business revision of our banking and currency laws be effected.

I attach much importance to the provision of my bill which makes it mandatory to have at least three days' public hearings in the various centrally located cities of the Republic. Banking, like every other business, takes color from its environments. The customs and the products of the people vary in different sections, the great mining interests, the great wheat interests, the great corn and cotton interests, the great cattle interests, the great investment interests of the East, each have their various lines of banking. Each of these various sections, to a greater or less extent, has a local press which reaches the majority of the people of those different sections. By having these hearings in accordance with this provision, thoughtful men in every section will have their interest awakened, their knowledge increased, and the tendency will be inevitably for all honest thinkers to urge some good plan best adapted to all the varying needs and conditions of trade throughout this wonderful country. It may be, Mr. Chairman, that such a commission might not recommend to Congress a banking and currency bill that would be passed by the body, but I venture to say that much of the existing ignorance and differences and political by-plays would disappear, and that the country and Congress would much more easily and with much more confidence enact a measure than is possible here and now, and it is of very great importance that any comprehensive revision of our banking and currency laws should be adequately discussed and, at least by those engaged in the business, be generally accepted in advance of its actual operation, so that confidence so absolutely essential to its success may not be shaken and the system at the beginning rendered ineffective.

Mr. Chairman, already we hear in this end and at the other end of this Capitol mutterings about majority and minority bills. They have already pending in the other side of this Capitol a so-called "majority bill" and a so-called "minority substitute," and if the committee of the House ever brings in anything except some such measure as I propose, I predict we will have a repetition of this miserable situation at this end. What confidence will the American business men and the American people have in a mere political scramble over office by making use of a great business question?

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BURGESS. Certainly.

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. You propose to appoint a commission; now, will you point to the successful operation of any commission in the history of the Government?

Mr. BURGESS. I believe no commission was ever appointed by Congress to collect information that was not worth infinitely more than it cost, and if it was not, the trouble grew out of the fact that people were not willing to study their reports. I think the Industrial Commission and its report had a profound influence in this country; I think the Monetary Commission and its report had a profound influence in this country; and I think the Tariff Commission and its report had a pronounced influence in this country; but the trouble was just what I am trying to avoid now. There were party differences about the questions with which they dealt, and men lined up with party regardless of what was said in the reports.

You wait until we have the Waterways Commission report, and see what a profound effect that will have for the general good of this country, in my judgment. I do not contend that this Commission's report would be followed by legislation exactly in accord with the recommendations made by it; but I do contend that growing out of it and the education of the masses of the people, under the methods prescribed in my bill, we will be infinitely more apt to have a successful measure, which will be accepted by the whole people than by any bipartisan legislation we may secure now.

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes.

Mr. OLLIE M. JAMES. You admit, however, that no recommendation made by the Commission was incorporated into law. Now, a commission is constituted only of men at last. Would not partisanship creep as much into a commission, and would not individual interests, corporate interests, and every class of interests creep into the Commission more easily even than into the membership of this House?

Mr. BURGESS. I do not think so, for this reason: They will be appointed under my bill as the representatives of great sections, to speak for the interests of their sections, and they will not be candidates for reelection at the hands of their constituents, which is the trouble now about this question, in a partisan way. We may as well confess the truth. All of us are more or less inclined to hold our ears to the ground and to preserve that telephonic, sympathetic connection which will promote continuity in office, and that is demonstrated now by the different views and positions that men take on both sides of this question.

But another proposition: Is it not wise, before legislation occurs, to arouse public thought and legislate in accord with an intelligent public demand? What kind of a Government is this? Do we own the people or do the people own us? Do we represent the people? Is it not wise, and especially so with a banking and currency question, so much dependent upon a wide public confidence—is it not infinitely wiser that before we act in a matter like this we discuss the situation broadly with the people and bring into cooperation and harmony, as much as possible, all the various channels of public thought? This will be done under the terms of my bill.

Banking is a colorable business. It takes on form and character largely from the locality and the products and the people with whom the business deals. There are mining banks, lumber banks, sugar banks, rice banks, stock banks, cotton banks, cattle banks, and so on through the great interests of this country. Under this bill public hearings would be held in all the great centers, all the great cities of the country, and the local press which is issued in each section would team with the hearings and the views of these different representative citizens as to what they thought should be done. The trouble often about hearings is that only the few who have money to pay their way and their hotel bills come to the hearings. We ought to go to the people with these hearings and let the people read in the local press what their representatives think about it, and out of the consensus of discussion and public thought all over the country it is certain, in my judgment, that we will ultimately get wiser legislation for all time to come than we will by any jumped-up legislation that you can whip through this House by any political power on one side or the other or a combination of both.

But there is another reason, potent in the exposition of the strength of the previous reasons, and that is, that the number, nature, and variety of the causes of our present condition preclude any present remedial action. It is my deliberate judgment that no analysis of the causes of our present condition which approaches accuracy suggests even the possibility of any present remedial legislation.

Now, let us look into the causes of this so-called panic, and we

will find here the same magnificent disagreement on diagnosis among the Senatorial and Congressional doctors that we find on remedies, when we look at the various bills that have been introduced. One very distinguished Republican, whose views I do not indorse on most public questions, but whose splendid ability and whose dauntless courage challenge every man's admiration, Senator FORAKER of Ohio, says that this panic was produced by a Roosevelt raid on railroads. He is bold and independent about it. He speaks of the billions of dollars involved in these great properties, of arousing public sentiment everywhere to war on them, national and State, of tying up and depressing their securities, of affecting the whole great transportation business of the country, producing this panic. Now, I am one of those who cheerfully voted for the control of the railroads. I believe it is Democratic legislation, and I would not stop in its support because our distinguished friend in the White House became Democratic on that subject and took our three national platforms and recommended their adoption in a Republican House.

Nor do I fall out with my distinguished Republican friends because they suddenly became Democratic in their desire to serve the people in this matter, but frankness forces me to admit that there is a measure of truth in Senator FORAKER's contention. It was unavoidably true that the attempt to regulate railroads in their rates was to affect the price of their securities, and especially those that had been boosted to a speculative value and those held in Europe. But that does not concern me, however, because if the legislation was just, and I believe it was, it ought to have been enacted, no matter if the effect was unavoidably to hurt the owners of property that had been mismanaged.

But I think that was not a very great cause operating in this panic, as a matter of fact. Of itself it would not have amounted to a ripple on the great financial shore. Two other distinguished Republicans have put that issue more broadly. Ex-Governor Frank Black, who, by the way, nominated President Roosevelt at the last Republican national convention, has recently said, in effect, that this panic was produced by the "man on the barrel;" and Chancellor Day, another distinguished gentleman, has likewise said, in substance, that this panic was the legitimate result of the Roosevelt raid on prosperity and attack on anybody that had any capital or that was trying to do any business.

I do not think myself there is so much in that. I am sure there is nothing in it in so far as President Roosevelt has been Democratic in his policy. I am not so sure but what there is something in it in some policies he has advocated which are un-Democratic, un-Republican, and un-American.

President Roosevelt has advocated the control by the Federal Government of all corporations engaged in interstate business. Seventy-five per cent of the business in this country is done by corporations in interstate business. Doubtless it was true that the holders of these great securities, as great and greater, authorities say, than the total securities of all the railroads in the United States, became alarmed; they feared that Roosevelt's success in regulating the railroads might be speedily followed by his success with Federal regulation of all corporations doing interstate business. That doubtless had the effect to depress the industrial securities and to cooperate for the depression of the railroad securities and to some extent in precipitating the panic. If so, no Democrat can be held responsible, for that policy was never written in the Democratic platform and, in my judgment, never will be. I do not care to discuss it further than to say that it is centralization "gone to seed."

Not only that, but President Roosevelt has recommended a graduated income tax. The Democratic party has declared for an income tax. It did pass such a law. The Democratic party is now for an income tax, but I hope it never will be foolish enough to declare for a graduated income tax, which is an unjust, unfair, un-Democratic, and un-American as a graduated ad valorem State tax on land would be. It means an increase of burden upon every man who has ability enough to increase his income. It violates all Democratic taxation principles and is confiscatory.

Not only that, but Mr. Roosevelt has recommended a Federal inheritance tax. That has never been declared for in any national Democratic platform, and I trust it never will be; not because the tax is not a fair one, but because it is a matter that ought to be handled alone by the States. It rests on such distinct grounds as pertain, in my judgment, alone to the powers of the States with reference to the holding and final distribution of property and the protection of property rights. An inheritance tax, if one is enacted following the logical situation, ought only to be by State enactment. The Federal Government has nothing to do with property and its descent and dis-

tribution, and has no business to go into that subject to derive Federal revenue from it.

The late President McKinley was rapidly producing an era of good feeling between the sections and among the classes, and undoubtedly was generally popular, and especially so among the capitalistic classes. The late Senator Marcus A. Hanna was still stronger with these classes, and was as close to the President as any man living. The fact that immediately after the death of President McKinley President Roosevelt proclaimed his purpose to follow in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessor predisposed this class toward President Roosevelt. The fact that President Roosevelt began soon thereafter to proceed upon utterly distinct and new lines, which were not approved by these classes, tended gradually to bring them into antagonism with him, and his success before the people and in Congress produced more and more alarm and disquiet in the centers of industry and finance, which has grown intense down to date. I am not discussing the wisdom of his course; I am stating the fact as tending to produce a condition, cooperative with other matters, which tended to precipitate the panic and to make it worse when it came. Again, it is a mistake to assume that all Republicans believe in the extension of Federal powers at the expense of the powers of the States, and large capital becomes easily suspicious along this line. It is my judgment, whatever else may be said of President Roosevelt, that he is, of all the Presidents in the history of the Republic, the centralizationist of our history, and that by word, act, and deed he has done more to magnify the Presidential office unduly and to extend the Federal power than any President the country has ever had, and hence is, in fact, further from fundamental democracy than any President the country has had.

Well, I shall not get more partisan than that. I wish simply to mention briefly those things which in my judgment have mingled with the real causes of this panic, and let the blame fall where it may, I shall be true to myself and my subject as I see it. Another man says that the bulk of this panic was caused by Wall street speculation. There is much in this in my judgment, but I am not willing to lay all the blame on the back of Wall street. I do not think all the speculators and all the gamblers in the country live in the city of New York. There are perhaps more of them there, and they are bigger ones and worse ones in power and effect, but I see no difference in principle in speculation in Texas and speculation in New York. Another one says it was the hoarding of money on the part of the people. I think there is less in that than in anything I have heard assigned as a cause for the panic. *That was an incident to the condition, not a cause.* If the causes had not operated, there would have been no hoarding, and there you are. Another one says it was holding crops for market in the South and West. I live there, and I love those people down there, but I am not going to be a demagogue about it. Frankly, I think that had some slight effect in the matter, because to withhold the crops from market beyond the normal period of marketing had the effect to lessen the draft in our favor on European gold and to tighten the demand locally among us for money, and that had some effect in the general relation of things—not a very great one in my judgment, nor do I think it is one that ought to be condemned; for if a man owns anything that is the product of his brain or body or both, he has a right to hold it if he can until he gets what he thinks it is worth before he turns it loose.

Another one says that the cause was individual, municipal, State, and national extravagance. I think there is something in that. I think the individuals in this country, the municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government have been going at a terrific pace in expenditure for the last ten years. I think it is time to slow down all along the line, but I think that was rather an incident than a cause of the condition which really produced this panic. Another one says it was governmental favoritism by the Republican party. I would like, if I could, to avoid any partisan reference in this matter, but candor to my subject and fairness to myself compels me to say I think there is much in that. I think the centralization policy of the tariff, that the policy of centralizing wealth by favoritism generally, tends always to aid the production of a panic and to make it worse when the conditions produce it. Undoubtedly the administration of the Government itself by the Republican party has contributed much to the production of this panic and to its magnitude as well. I call to mind the fact that you have administered the Government so as to tax wealth out of the pockets of the people and to accumulate in the Treasury a surplus of about \$250,000,000, thus contracting yourself the circulation of the money and then pursuing the policy of loaning this out for nothing, in the aid of Wall street mainly. And this method being known, it tended to sustain a speculative period,

and therefore to make the crash worse when it came. The Government ought to be economically administered, so as to make the revenues and the expenditures closely tally, since the taxes are taken up generally, and hence annually the circulation contracted. I wish just here to specifically condemn, no matter what Administration follows it, the practice of accumulating a big surplus in the Treasury, as well as that of loaning it out without interest, and of course, since we are human as well as partisan, to our bank favorites. I think it is true that for a series of years wealth has been taxed out of the pockets of the masses and into the pockets of the classes and that class legislation has given the classes the power to concentrate wealth in a large degree. These classes are massed about the great financial centers, and cooperate with, and in many cases are, stock gamblers, and hence when trouble comes it comes swiftly and with more deadly effect than it would if the wealth of the people had been evenly distributed under wise and beneficent laws, such as I hope to see enacted when the Democratic party comes into power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

But it is my candid judgment that not any of these causes, nor all of them combined, would have produced this panic except for other things. I believe two things were mainly responsible for the present panic. Before I name them and elucidate that, I want to size it up in a breath, in a homely sort of way, when I say that for ten or eleven years this country has been on a protracted prosperity "spree," and it has got to "sober up." That is the whole story. All these other causes were more or less cooperative, but minor causes. The major causes were these two things. Let us look back a little. Fifteen years ago we were a debtor country; nearly all of our securities were held abroad. If you wanted to build a railroad you had to finance it in Europe, and if you wanted to go into any great industrial undertaking you had largely to do the same thing, and mortgages of foreign loan companies were plastered all over the soil from Maine to Texas. Two things began to happen, and they happened rapidly and continuously. First, our exports began to run up in excess over our imports. Beginning in 1896 down to date the balance of trade in our favor has been in round numbers four billions of dollars. The American wheat raiser, the American cotton raiser—for cotton is still king and will remain so for an hundred years—the cattle producers, got out their products into the markets of Europe more and more, year by year. Those were the three main articles that make up this great balance of trade, as reports from bureaus of your own Departments will show. What was the effect of that? It rapidly changed us from a debtor to a creditor nation, brought increased capacity to buy everywhere, opened up more farms and more ranches, and that stimulated all the avenues of trade, increased the foreign trade, operated to produce prosperity in the natural, God-given way it must be produced, for I want to say to you that I have contempt for the idea of producing permanent and universal prosperity by law. I believe that prosperity is a hybrid; that it is a product of the blessing of God in soil and season and the industry and intelligence of mankind combined. [Applause.] That is what makes America great. Cooperating with that there were sudden discoveries of gold and cheaper processes of mining, and there began to pour in a flood of money. That increase went into our circulation. We have added in ten years more than a billion dollars to our money in this country, every dollar good, every dollar equal in purchasing as well as debt-paying power with every other dollar.

That process has been going on annually. The last fiscal year we added in gold alone the amount of \$125,000,000 to the circulation of our country, an increase of more than \$75 per capita, based upon the increase in the population. To give the figures accurately from this last report of the Comptroller of the Currency, we had in 1896 a gold circulation of \$8. We have now a gold circulation of \$17. What did this all mean? Why, it meant an era of rising prices everywhere. Why? Because it is an eternal, immutable truth that value is the creature of relation. When you measure in dollars that are good it is an axiom that as you increase the dollars you increase the relation and increase the price. There is no escape from it. We have had an era of rising prices. Everything has been going up—stocks, bonds, lands; everything from goats to goobers have been going up for ten years in this country. What is the result of that? Why, every man who had any sense went plunging. He felt that it was a period in which he could get rich quick. He could afford to buy anything if he got it at a fair value now, and that next year it was a cinch it would be worth more; and we went on investing all the money we could get hold of and strained our credit to the limit. Confidence was universal, the country was prosperous, every man's credit was better than he ever knew it to be in all his life

before, and all men everywhere rushed into business indiscriminately, looking to the womb of futurity to wring out profits for him. The bears went permanently into winter quarters; the bull was rampant everywhere—in the stock market, in the produce market, in the grain market, in the cotton market, in the real-estate market, in the vegetable market; everywhere the bull was getting in his work, and our Republican friends, with all the political tricks they were capable of and led by the matchless business-vote catcher, Marcus A. Hanna, began whooping this thing for all it was worth. They were going out on every stump, and they were preaching "prosperity follows the flag of Republican victory." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

"No calamity can afflict the American people so long as the Government is in the hands of the Republicans." You took advantage of a calamity under the last Democratic Administration, which was more attributable to Harrison's Administration, or the conditions, rather, which existed under Harrison's Administration, than to the conditions under Cleveland, and you went out into the country and you said, "Why, you did this and that; just look what has happened;" and you got a great many cotton raisers to believe that somehow there was kind of a relation between 5-cent cotton and the party in power at Washington. You corrupted the current of public thought; you preached the utterly foolish doctrine that legislation and administrative policies can produce and preserve universal and permanent prosperity. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And at a time when every mother's son of you who claimed that could not but admit to yourselves that you fooled the people and yourselves, too. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There was nothing in it; there never was anything in it, and if people expect to be permanently and universally prosperous they must recognize the fundamental truth that all relations of life are interdependent, and that upon the cooperation of honor, genius, industry, and economy, all combined, working upon the natural great resources of our country, depends really the prosperity and the success of the American people. I often have sat here in my seat and thought of two years ago, when my bright and smiling friend, the genial gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS], and the courtly little gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and the rugged, vigorous intellect from Iowa [Mr. HEPEURN] preached to this House the doctrine that the Republican party had produced prosperity in this country, and that all that imperiled it was the possible success of the Democratic party. My friend, Mr. LANDIS, said that you would find all over Indiana signposts everywhere, "All kinds of work for all kinds of men;" and I wondered whether the signs had been taken down lately or not. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

You gentlemen have corrupted, as I said a while ago, the channels of public thought by preaching this kind of paternalistic idea that government is the "daddy" of all the people and flings out its blessings in bunches all around.

Quit it! Let us be honest in the face of this great national crisis. We are willing to help you by standing by the truth now as we stood by it then. We will not charge you with having been wholly responsible for this panic. We will tell the real causes. Now, you have got an opportunity to get straight and get back on the road to truth and right. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is time to make a confession. Under all these conditions the whole people became drunk with the wine of prosperity. They inflated values and credits far beyond actual relations, to which they must in fact conform, if the financial and industrial health of the country is to be perfect. Thoughtful men began to realize that we were floating on the dangerous sea of inflation; stocks and bonds, the first things, perhaps, to respond to such a condition, began to waver in upward tendency, and then to come down; then the bears came out of their winter quarters and proceeded in every artful way, by every device of which they are masters, to further depress the prices by intensifying the scare which existed; the bull banks and the bear banks were drawn into the struggle, as their interests and connections prompted; alarm grew apace, banking antagonisms intensified, the fright wandered into the homes of the depositors, the demand for money suddenly became general and clamorous, Wall street ran to the Treasury—its favorite resort when it wants something for nothing—and got what it could, but it was not enough; and then, in self-defense, Wall street enacted a law of its own and bulwarked itself behind it, and refused to pay out except under a daily limit of an insignificant amount, and then the sober-up process was on everywhere, and the panic was an accomplished fact.

Well, naturally the question suggests itself: What do you want done? Nothing! That is plain English. You tell me that you can legislate values and credits in this country? You tell me that you can legislate public confidence into values and

credits, which is but another form of stating the same proposition? You tell me that to inflate the currency would benefit this situation? Not on your life! That would only make it worse. You might just as well talk, and with just as much reason, of legislating a drunken man sober as to legislatively cure this condition. It has got to work itself out. There has got to be a readjustment of values and credits. There has got to be a wider recognition of what honest and conservative banking means, and the bankers are learning a sore lesson in these days. They are learning that this speculation with deposits, and this plunging into various side issues with their bank and involving its capital, will not do. There is no other way to face this situation. There is no use in playing demagogue about it. I am tired to death of this constant cry when anything happens in the country, from an earthquake to a failure of the peanut crop, to run to Congress and the legislatures in order to do something for the people. We have got "American dementia," not on the question of love, but we have got it on the question of law. The Republican party is largely responsible for it. It is time to tell the American people the truth. It is time to say frankly that this condition is beyond legislative present relief. You ask me whether I am in favor of issuing more money, and I tell you no. We are pouring \$100,000,000 of gold now into circulation annually. We have now more money per capita than any nation in the world except France, and we have more gold per capita than France has. We do not need it.

The last report of the Comptroller of the Currency says, page 2:

Monetary systems and approximate stocks of money, in the aggregate and per capita, in the principal countries of the world, December 31, 1906.

Country.	Monetary stand-ard.	Monetary unit.	Popula-tion.	Stock of gold.			Stock of silver.			Uncover-ed paper.	Per capita.				
				In banks and pub-lic treas-uries.	In circu-lation.	Total.	Full tender.	Limited tender.	Total.		Gold.	Silver.	Paper.	Total.	
			Thou-sands.	Thou-sands.	Thou-sands.	Thou-sands.	Thou-sands.	Thou-sands.	Thou-sands.	Thou-sands.					
United States.....	Gold.....	Dollar.....	85,400	\$1,081,500	\$511,800	\$1,593,300	\$571,300	\$127,400	\$698,700	\$610,800	\$18.66	\$8.18	\$7.15	\$33.99	
Austria-Hungary.....	do.....	Crown.....	49,400	\$229,500	\$76,900	\$306,400	(c)	\$105,300	\$105,300	\$119,300	6.20	2.13	2.41	10.74	
Belgium.....	do.....	Franc.....	7,200	\$20,200	\$10,900	\$31,100	\$15,000	\$9,700	\$24,700	\$125,800	4.32	3.43	17.47	25.22	
British Empire:															
Australasia.....	do.....	Pound sterling...	4,800	\$110,400	\$14,600	\$125,000	(c)	\$10,000	\$10,000	(c)	26.04	2.08		28.12	
Canada.....	do.....	Dollar.....	5,800	\$62,400	(c)	\$62,400	(c)	\$6,700	\$6,700	\$72,500	10.76	1.15	12.50	24.41	
United Kingdom.....	do.....	Pound sterling...	44,100	\$196,400	\$290,300	\$486,700	(c)	\$116,800	\$116,800	\$116,800	11.03	2.65	2.65	16.33	
India.....	do.....	Pound sterling and rupee.	295,200	\$18,900	\$318,400	\$337,300	\$603,800	(c)	\$603,800	\$88,900	1.14	2.05	.13	3.32	
South Africa.....	do.....	Pound sterling...	7,700	\$46,400	\$15,000	\$61,400	(c)	\$20,000	\$20,000	(c)	7.97	2.60		10.57	
Straits Settlements.....	Silver.....	Dollar.....	5,400	\$600	(c)	\$600	\$42,000	\$7,000	\$49,000	\$22,200	.11	9.07	4.11	13.29	
Bulgaria.....	Gold.....	Lev.....	4,000	\$7,200	(c)	\$7,200	\$1,000	\$2,200	\$3,200	\$2,900	1.80	.80	.73	3.33	
Cuba.....	do.....	Peseta.....	1,600	\$38,200	(c)	\$38,200	(c)	\$5,000	\$5,000	(c)	23.88	3.12		27.00	
Denmark.....	do.....	Crown.....	2,600	\$22,600	(c)	\$22,600	(c)	\$6,100	\$6,100	\$10,700	8.69	2.35	4.11	15.15	
Egypt.....	do.....	Plaster.....	11,200	\$7,300	\$132,700	\$140,000	(c)	\$15,000	\$15,000	(c)	12.50	1.34		13.84	
Finland.....	do.....	Markkaa.....	2,800	\$5,100	(c)	\$5,100	(c)	\$400	\$400	\$12,700	1.82	.14	4.54	6.50	
France.....	do.....	Franc.....	39,300	\$520,100	\$406,300	\$926,400	\$347,400	\$63,700	\$411,100	\$269,200	23.57	10.46	6.85	40.88	
Germany.....	do.....	Mark.....	60,600	\$145,700	\$884,600	\$1,030,300	(c)	\$219,700	\$219,700	\$267,100	17.00	3.62	4.41	25.03	
Greece.....	do.....	Drachma.....	2,400	\$5,400	\$200	\$5,600	\$100	(c)	\$100	\$42,600	2.33	.04	17.75	20.12	
Haiti.....	do.....	Gourde.....	1,400	\$1,000	(c)	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,500	\$2,500	\$7,600	.71	1.79	5.43	7.93	
Italy.....	do.....	Lira.....	33,700	\$215,500	(c)	\$215,500	\$28,300	\$3,400	\$31,700	\$150,600	6.39	.94	4.47	11.80	
Japan.....	do.....	Yen.....	51,700	\$73,300	\$6,800	\$80,100	(c)	\$48,200	\$48,200	\$96,900	1.55	.93	1.87	4.35	
Mexico.....	do.....	Peso.....	13,600	\$8,600	\$31,400	\$40,000	\$52,800	\$4,000	\$56,800	\$51,200	2.94	4.18	3.76	10.88	
Netherlands.....	do.....	Florin.....	5,600	\$26,700	\$19,200	\$45,900	\$48,000	\$4,600	\$52,600	\$57,800	8.20	9.39	10.82	27.91	
Norway.....	do.....	Crown.....	2,300	\$8,300	(c)	\$8,300	(c)	\$3,100	\$3,100	\$7,000	3.61	1.35	3.04	8.00	
Portugal.....	do.....	Milreis.....	5,400	\$5,500	\$3,100	\$8,600	(c)	\$33,400	\$33,400	\$61,200	1.59	6.19	11.33	19.11	
Roumania.....	do.....	Leu.....	6,600	\$20,700	(c)	\$20,700	(c)	\$600	\$600	\$27,600	3.14	.09	4.18	7.41	
Russia.....	do.....	Ruble.....	143,400	\$609,000	\$330,400	\$939,400	(c)	\$77,900	\$77,900	(c)	6.55	.54		7.09	
Serbia.....	do.....	Dinar.....	2,700	\$300	\$1,900	\$2,200	(c)	\$3,200	\$3,200	\$1,500	.81	1.19	.55	2.55	
Siam.....	do.....	Tical.....	6,100	(c)	(c)	(c)	\$44,500	(c)	\$44,500	\$1,100		7.29	.18	7.47	
South American States:															
Argentina.....	do.....	Peso.....	5,700	\$90,000	\$12,700	\$102,700	(c)	(c)	(c)	\$293,300	18.02		51.45	69.47	
Bolivia.....	Silver.....	Boliviana.....	1,800	\$400	(c)	\$400	\$3,800	(c)	\$3,800	(c)	.22	2.11		2.33	
Brazil.....	Gold.....	Milreis.....	16,000	\$21,200	(c)	\$21,200	(c)	\$100	\$100	\$363,000	1.33	.06	22.63	24.02	
Chile.....	do.....	Peso.....	3,200	\$2,000	(c)	\$2,000	(c)	\$6,700	\$6,700	\$42,300	.63	2.09	13.22	15.94	
Colombia.....	do.....	Dollar.....	4,500	\$100	(c)	\$100	(c)	(c)	(c)	\$1,000,000	.02		222.22	222.24	
Ecuador.....	do.....	Sucre.....	1,300	\$1,800	\$1,900	\$3,700	(c)	\$1,400	\$1,400	\$1,900	2.85	1.07	1.46	5.38	
Guiana:															
British.....	do.....	Pound sterling...	300	\$100	(c)	\$100	(c)	\$100	\$100	\$600	.33	.83	2.00	2.66	
Dutch.....	do.....	Florin.....	100	\$200	(c)	\$200	(c)	\$200	\$200	\$200	2.00	2.00	2.00	6.00	
French.....	do.....	Franc.....	100	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)	\$600			6.00	6.00	
Paraguay.....	do.....	Peso.....	700	\$100	(c)	\$100	(c)	(c)	(c)	\$35,000	.14		50.00	50.14	
Peru.....	do.....	Sol.....	4,600	\$2,900	\$3,900	\$6,800	(c)	\$2,400	\$2,400	(c)	1.48		.52	2.00	
Uruguay.....	do.....	Peso.....	1,000	\$15,500	(c)	\$15,500	(c)	\$4,300	\$4,300	\$1,700	15.50	4.30	1.70	21.50	
Venezuela.....	do.....	Bolivar.....	2,600	\$300	(c)	\$300	(c)	\$700	\$700	(c)	.11	.27		.38	
Spain.....	do.....	Peseta.....	18,800	\$90,900	(c)	\$90,900	(c)	\$173,700	\$173,700	\$97,100	4.84	9.24	5.16	19.21	
Sweden.....	do.....	Crown.....	5,300	\$19,400	\$3,200	\$22,600	(c)	\$7,700	\$7,700	\$34,800	4.26	1.45	6.57	12.28	
Switzerland.....	do.....	Franc.....	3,300	\$21,200	\$7,800	\$29,000	(c)	\$11,600	\$11,600	\$24,600	8.79	3.51	7.45	19.75	
Turkey.....	do.....	Plaster.....	24,000	\$10,000	\$40,000	\$50,000	\$30,000	\$10,000	\$40,000	(c)	2.07	1.66		3.73	
Central American States.....	Silver ^h	Peso.....	4,700	\$2,000	(c)	\$2,000	(c)	\$7,400	\$7,400	\$62,900	.43	1.57	13.38	15.38	
China.....	do.....	Tael.....	330,100	(c)	(c)	(c)	\$350,000	(c)	\$350,000	(c)		1.06		1.06	
Total.....			1,330,100	3,764,900	3,124,000	6,888,900	2,139,000	1,121,200	3,260,200	4,132,000	5.18	2.45	3.10	10.73	

^a In United States Treasury and national banks.

^b Official information furnished through United States representatives.

^c No information.

^d Estimate, Bureau of the Mint.

^e The figures for the total stock of gold in India are for the net imports since 1893-94 plus the production of the country. The amount in the government treasury is from official advice. The net imports of gold since 1835-36, when the records begin, amount to \$841,407,489, and the production recorded to \$115,030,200. The tide of gold and silver has been flowing into India for centuries.

From the latest and most reliable data obtained by the Director of the Mint it is estimated that at the close of the calendar year 1906 the stock of money of the world was \$14,281,100,000, divided as follows: Gold, \$6,888,900,000; silver (full and limited tender), \$3,260,200,000; uncovered paper currency, \$4,132,000,000. Eighty per cent of the gold—that is, \$5,588,900,000—was held by eight countries of the globe, and in amounts in the order named: United States, \$1,593,300,000; Germany, \$1,030,300,000; Russia, \$939,400,000; France, \$926,400,000; United Kingdom, \$486,700,000; Austria-Hungary, \$306,400,000; Italy, \$215,500,000, and Spain, \$90,900,000. Over 56 per cent of the stock of silver, namely, \$1,834,900,000, is held by the same countries, the United States leading with \$698,700,000, followed by France with \$411,100,000; Germany, \$219,700,000; Spain, \$173,700,000; United Kingdom, \$116,800,000; Austria-Hungary, \$105,300,000; Russia, \$77,900,000, and Italy, \$31,700,000. Forty per cent of the stock of uncovered paper currency was also held by these countries, the United States again leading with \$610,800,000, France being second on the list with \$269,200,000, followed by Germany with \$267,100,000; Italy, \$150,600,000; Austria-Hungary, \$119,300,000; United Kingdom, \$116,800,000, and Spain, \$97,100,000. Outside of the countries named India has the largest stock of gold, namely, \$337,300,000, followed by Argentina with \$102,700,000. The stock of gold in Japan is \$80,100,000. The latter country reports silver to the amount of \$48,200,000 and uncovered paper currency, \$96,900,000. Exclusive of the United States, the largest stock of silver is in India, namely, \$603,800,000. The circulation of Colombia, with the exception of \$100,000 in gold, is in uncovered paper currency, stated at \$1,000,000,000. The per capita of gold, \$23.57, and of all money, \$40.88, is the greatest in France, followed by the United States, with a per capita of gold of \$18.66 and a per capita of all money of \$33.99. Germany is third in the list, with a gold per capita of \$17 and an aggregate per capita of all circulation of \$25.03. The details of the Mint report relate to 47 countries, and include information as to the monetary standard, monetary unit, and population of each country.

An on pages 330 and 331 he gives a table showing per capita circulation, by countries, as follows:

^f Includes Straits Settlements, the Malay States, and Johore.

^g L'Economiste Europeen, January 1, 1906.

^h Except Costa Rica and British Honduras—gold-standard countries.

ⁱ Le Marche Financier, 1907.

^k These figures may include some gold credits in foreign banks.

NOTE.—The value of the monetary stock of the silver-standard countries has been changed to conform to the decline in silver values. The monetary stock of Mexico and other countries where the Mexican dollar circulates is given in Mexican dollars at bullion value.

From these facts it seems clear, when we consider the further fact that we are adding more than a hundred millions in gold to our circulation annually, that we do not, at this time, need any permanent addition to our money volume. What we need is a wide recognition of the necessity for sobering up as quickly as possible and getting busy about it. That is all. Now, do you think anything ought to be done hereafter? Yes; I think so. That is one of the reasons why I am pressing my banking and currency bill. I think it may be possible to devise some safe and wise emergency currency system which will lessen the force and effect of these recurrent periods of inflation when they come, as come they will. You need not be in a hurry about it, however. It may be ten years before another one comes. The Presidential election will be over to a dead moral certainty before another one comes. You need not worry about that. I think this one will last until after the Presidential election. I hope it will not last any longer. But I can tell you more easily what I do not want and why I do not want it, than I can tell you what I do want and why I do want it. I have somewhat decided views as to some things that are pending, that I do not want, and I desire to mention them and tell why I do not want them. One of the first of these is the Fowler bill. Now, it may be possible in a series of future years that some such plan as this distinguished and able man proposes may finally be arrived at.

But I will tell you now if he expects the American Congress and the American people to adopt a bill so radical in all of its provisions, changing all existing systems from top to bottom, he is absolutely hugging a delusion to his bosom. The interests are too vast. The public tension is too suspicious and acute. The situation is such that if we ever come to any such system as he proposes, it must be through a series of years by careful steps, each tested by the light of experience. The main and serious objection to his bill is that it is too sweeping, too drastic, too infinite, too great in its effects, to be considered for a moment.

Then, there is the Aldrich bill. I need not discuss it in detail, because I presume all of the Members are thoroughly familiar with its provisions. It proposes, in brief, to issue \$500,000,000 of currency upon the security of State, municipal, and railroad bonds. I do not care to discuss the railroad feature, because you could cut that out and I would be against it as I was before. I am not going to be led into the bushes on that.

I am opposed to any sort or any form of such bond currency. It will not do, for several reasons. In the first place these State and county bonds inevitably drift into the hands of a few owners of large capital, and that sort of emergency currency must simply mean a bondholders' currency. It puts in the hands of a few men the power to contract or inflate our currency at will. This will do no good to the money centers, it will do no good to the agricultural and mining sections, but do infinite hurt in fright and scare and uncertainty and unrest all the time to the whole country. It is no advantage to the country. You say that it will increase the price of those State and municipal bonds. Doubtless that is true.

But that only makes a bad matter worse for two reasons. In the first place it is bad enough for the Federal Government to have a banking system based on boosting its national bonds. To have another class of currency, called emergency currency, based on boosting the bonds of the States and municipalities is a governmental procedure which I can not at all indorse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, by authority of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] I yield to the gentleman twenty minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Thanks; I will try to get through in that time.

Not only that, these securities and bonds can not be held by the banks in the South and West, because of the low rate of interest; and if you pass a bill for this currency system, which you admit would lower the rate of interest on such bonds, you will make it impossible for the banks in the South and West, in the great developing sections, the great crop-moving sections, the sections where they are really interested in an emergency currency, to have any advantage at all out of such currency. The banks out in those sections that can loan their money at 8 and 9 and 10 per cent will not invest in bonds that are bearing 2, 3, and 4 per cent. They can not afford it; and when the pinch comes they will have no money to buy the bonds and will have to hie themselves away to the financial centers to get the money; and they will be in a worse condition than they were before. Any man who favors that kind of a policy had better change his domicile to the East, for he will be put out of office by an outraged people.

Another proposition is greenbacks. I thought that had been

settled. I thought that never again would we have a proposition to issue irredeemable paper money, and I am not going to seriously discuss it now, further than to say that I believe, and I have always believed, in an intrinsic-value dollar and paper money redeemable in such coin, and every dollar coined and issued shall be the equal of every other dollar in purchasing as well as in debt-paying power. I shall support no system of coinage or currency which does not conform to these principles.

Another much-advocated plan is presented in various forms or guaranteeing the deposits of the banks. I shall not support any such scheme as that. I wish to give reasons as briefly as I can why I will not support any proposition, whether directive or permissive, guaranteeing deposits in national banks. In either case the principle is identical, for there is no difference between a father who directs his boy to do a foolish thing and the father who permits the boy knowingly to do a foolish thing. He indorses it and is responsible for the principle.

This is the first objection I have to this, that it is socialistic in its tendency if not in effect. Why? Under that plan you would throw in hodgepodge capacity and character with incompetency and rascality and lay a tax on all to protect the negligent depositors and the incompetent and rascally banks at the expense of the wise and conservative bankers and the careful depositors. Not only that. There is a worse thing involved in it than that.

It is the inalienable right of every individual in this country to get all the premium that character and capacity gives him in any business in which he seeks to engage, and if he goes into the banking business he is a candidate for deposits. The essence of socialism is to equalize by law capacity and character and opportunity; to make all men equal in property and privilege and happiness. It's a dream of the impossible. To admit the possibility of its accomplishment is a confession of ignorance of that true nature and condition of mankind upon which is grounded all religion and all wise government. "Equal rights to all men and special privileges to none" is an immutable truth. An open, fair field for competitive struggle is the thing. The banker is no exception.

He has his character and his capacity as well as his capital as an inducement to invite these deposits, and by this sort of plan you say to the conservative banker, "Your character and capacity are worth nothing to you in your struggle for deposits. We take that advantage away from you and minimize it and equalize it with the other banker who is incompetent, without character or capacity, and you can not get deposits by reason of that any more than he can." It is a wrong governmental principle. It is a step toward socialism, toward the destruction of the value of character and capacity in the practical operation of the banking business. It is a blow at competitive struggle.

That leads me to the next objection, which is as bad, and that is that it is bad business policy, as bad as the governmental policy. The Book says, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," and I believe the fear of the depositor is the beginning of wise, conservative banking. It is no answer to say to me, as I have many friends say, "Why, the average depositor does not know anything about the condition of the bank." Maybe so, but he may know. The banker knows he may know. The knowledge that he may know has the same effect on the banker as if he actually knew. Not only that, but many of these national banks are one-man affairs. Directors are dummies; the controlling stock is actually owned by one man. He dictates it and controls it in the hollow of his hand, and almost invariably in such a case he uses the bank as an adjunct to other and speculative enterprises outside. Now, if you remove this check and pile up deposits in his bank, you will only increase his venturesomeness, his power to do evil, by the use of the deposits in the bank and these speculative outside ventures.

But you say that the banker would not make an investment or a loan under the guaranty system that he would not make under the present system. Well, you do not know men as I do. Men are often nicely balanced in their judgment, good men and conservative men, as to whether they will make a certain investment or not, and the wavering balance is tipped against the investment when the depositor is out on the end of it. Take away that balance, and he will make the investment, he will take the risk, and in the case of the rascal and the incompetent it is a cinch that he will do it. That is not all. It is impracticable anyhow under the conditions that obtain. Let me read to you from the report of the Treasurer, just issued. On page 419 you will find this:

The percentage of capital of national banks to capital of all banks in 1906 was 50.23; deposits, 32.12. For the present year the percentage of capital is 49.66 and of deposits 31.66. During the period from 1902 to 1907 the percentage of capital of banks other than national to

the capital of all banks has increased from 47.06 to 50.44 per cent and the percentage of individual deposits in such banks from 67.7 to 68.34.

From that it is clear that of individual deposits in the country, 68 per cent are in banks other than national banks. Now, we have no authority to deal with any banks except national banks. If you pass a guaranty law of any sort, permissive or directive, if these gentlemen are right when they say that such a law would bring the hoarders up with their cash, then it must be more certain that those who have their deposits in banks where they may lose would rush to take them into banks where they could not lose, and an era of bank panic and bank collection and debt collection would be precipitated that would involve 68 per cent of all the depositors of the country and half of all the bank capital of the country.

"Oh," but you say, "we will put the operation of the law off so far that these can all cooperate with the system that we enact." Yes; but how will they cooperate? They could not organize under a national-bank charter, because they could not get bonds enough to do it, and they could not cooperate otherwise, because forty-six States would have to act on this matter through their legislatures and change their systems and adjust themselves to it; and even if they could, the fear that they could not or that they would not would operate in the meantime to make men get into all kinds of financial troubles about their deposits, their business, and their capital.

That is not all of this miserable policy, which is like all socialistic schemes, fair to look at and bitter to taste. Suppose we inaugurated the system; suppose all of the banks cooperated, the State banks, the national banks, and the private banks all come under it and everybody's deposits are secured. What then? At once there is set up a competitive struggle among the bankers for deposits. One pays 2 per cent, another pays 3 per cent, another pays 4 per cent, another pays 5 per cent, and it is a cinch that the more competent, conservative, and wise the banker is the lower rate of interest he would pay. So this miserable plan stands revealed in its last analysis as a scheme to induce men to wild and speculative banking, a plan necessarily leading to wild and speculative banking. A banker who is willing to take the risk runs the rate of interest up, gets more deposits, and plunges into speculative enterprises, trusting to recoup himself for the high rate of interest.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Let me suggest another thing to the gentleman. The only margin of safety is the double liability of the stockholder, which can not be loaned, and under the guaranty system a \$25,000 bank would be as liable to receive a million dollars of deposits as a million-dollar bank would.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his suggestion. There are a number of other reasons that would suggest themselves, but I think these reasons which I have given are sufficient and will, if you accept them, settle that controversy and eliminate that issue.

Now, what else? Frankly, I am uncertain, and I think everybody else is that I have talked with, whether we should have a central Government bank with branch banks or whether we should have the German plan grafted on to our plan, as suggested by the bankers' association, or whether we shall change the whole system suggested by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FOWLER]. I will tell you what I think it is best to do, and that is have a banking and currency commission thrash it out and try to do what is wise and right. We are at a time where we can get the whole public aroused, where we can arouse all the patriotism and the best sense of the country, and get a plan that will work splendidly for years.

You know, and I know, and all of us know, that our present banking system is nothing but a piece of crazy patchwork, born of the necessities of war times and patched at ever since, from then to now, and if anything is done here this Congress it will be only another patch put on this system. We can have a comprehensive revision of our banking and currency laws and perhaps some adaptation that will permit a safe and sound emergency currency that will work automatically, will meet these fluctuating periods in crop movements, and will lessen the effect of panics of inflation and contraction periods in the future. I hope such a system can be devised.

It is rather my opinion that such a commission as that for which my bill provides, operating as directed in the bill, would lead public thought to this conclusion; they would devise and recommend in detail some such general plan as that proposed by the bankers' association, which, as I understand it, is an effort to take the principle of the German system and graft it upon our present national banking system. I am frank to concede my attachment to the theory that all the money coined and issued should be coined and issued by the Government. But theories are only valuable as they are practicable and workable theories. If the Government is to issue an emergency

currency, unless under some such plan as the Aldrich plan, it must go into the banking business, with a central bank and branch banks, so that money, when issued, can be loaned to the people and can be taken out of circulation when the need passes. I am not willing for the Government to go into the banking business. It is likely true that but for the partisan character of our Government the German plan as a whole would work well here, or the French plan as a whole would work well here; but I do not believe that any central bank, with or without branch banks, would work well in a country so intense in its politics and so divided in its interests as ours. Now, if we are not going to do either of these things, namely, issue a bond-secured emergency currency or go into the banking business with the Government, what other plan has anybody to suggest, save some such plan as that proposed by the bankers' association? It may be that recommendations of bankers are looked on by the people a good deal like the Prohibitionists would view resolutions of the brewers' association. But if this plan was thoroughly thrashed out before the country, and the men who are in banks, as well as those who are not, strove earnestly together to develop the best possible system for an emergency currency, it is my opinion they will be forced to some such plan as this. Under that plan all good security would receive equal governmental consideration. If an emergency currency could be issued by national banks in addition to their present bond issues, based properly upon their reserve and capital, properly limited in amount and with proper rates of interest, under such a system cotton and wheat sections, mining and cattle sections, would have equal opportunity for such emergency currency as their needs demanded, nor would Wall street be any worse off. It looks to me as if the national banking system were here to stay and that it is useless to talk about getting rid of it for years to come.

And it is a debatable question, to say the least of it, whether it would be wise to get rid of it at all, save by the gradual process of paying off the national bonds. They would be the best existing medium through which to issue an emergency currency, and I see no reason why such a plan can not be devised which would be "safe and sane." I am of opinion also that changes in the system should be made, such as changing the reserve features so as to give greater security to the depositors and stability and independence to the banks and more strict supervision of them in the interest of the public.

In conclusion, I thank my colleagues for their earnest attention. [Applause.]

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LAWRENCE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 16882, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

INTERSTATE TRANSFER RAILWAY COMPANY.

The Speaker laid before the House the bill (H. R. 16050) to authorize the Interstate Transfer Railway Company to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota, with Senate amendments thereto.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. JENKINS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

COTTON TAX.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter relating to the cotton tax.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter relating to the cotton tax. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., February 7, 1908.

HON. FRANK CLARK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CLARK: I have read with very great pleasure your exhaustive speech on the cotton tax, which I find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 29th January.

For years I have lived with the memory of the cotton tax, and your speech has given me such satisfaction that I feel that a long-absent friend has returned to gladden my old age.

You will recognize in my signature the case of Farrington v. Saunders, and will understand the very great interest I have felt for about forty years in this matter. Mr. Robertson Tapp, who has been dead many years, was the father of my wife, and the cotton tax was a never-ending subject of conversation around our family circle.

I paid the tax to the collector in Memphis and shipped the cotton to Liverpool. We conferred with such eminent lawyers as Judge Curtis, Judge Sharkey, Phillips, Pike, Tapp, William M. Evarts, and others, and they all expressed great faith in the outcome of our case—certainly on its merits.

A few years ago, before Mr. Evarts's death, when we were considering presenting a bill before Congress, I wrote to inquire if he would go before a committee of the House and present our case, and he readily consented to do so, and wrote me that he had conferred with Judge Curtis, who agreed with him that the tax was unconstitutional. I have his letter somewhere with my papers. I don't think Mr. Evarts filed a written argument; only made an oral one.

I have written from time to time to various distinguished men on this subject, such as Senator CLAY, JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, and others, who fully concur with you about this tax.

I feel much gratified that the Honorable Grosvenor should have the independence to express himself as he did in his letter to you. I saw in the daily press an account of your speech. I will thank you to send me several copies for myself and friends. I will add that after reading what you said to Congress, that my faith in recovery has been renewed. It may be delayed, but, like the French spoliation claim, it must meet with justice. I was a merchant during the years 1862-1868 and represent many claims for this tax.

Very respectfully,

WM. M. FARRINGTON,
526 Beale Avenue.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some remarks I made on Monday last respecting a bill to establish a Federal court at Jackson, Ky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 3426. An act to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 4455. An act to establish a fish-hatching and fish-culture station in the State of Tennessee—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 3433. An act to establish on the coast of the Pacific States a station for the investigation of problems connected with the marine-fishery interests of that region—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1407. An act to extend the provisions of the existing bounty-land laws to the officers and enlisted men and the officers and men of the boat companies of the Florida Seminole Indian war—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 3351. An act to establish a marine biological station on the Gulf coast of the State of Florida—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 4740. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the civil war and certain widows of such soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1699. An act for the relief of Thomas C. Chappell—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3528. An act for the relief of Durham W. Stevens—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3526. An act to amend section 876 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 60. An act for the relief of the Chicago, Peoria and St. Louis Railway Company of Illinois—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4066. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to increase the compensation of inspectors of customs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 2483. An act to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Moutara Reef, California—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4734. An act to provide for the transfer of a certain fund from "depredations upon public lands" to the credit of the White Earth bands of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 4639. An act to provide for participation by the United States in an international exposition to be held at Tokyo, Japan, in 1912—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

S. 2027. An act for the relief of Phillip Hague, administrator of the estate of Joseph Hague, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3941. An act to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act to prevent unlawful occupancy of the public lands," approved February 25, 1885—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 4548. An act to provide for the sale of timber on allotted and unallotted land, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2609. An act providing for the acceptance of a donation

of land situated at the Palisades, in the State of New Jersey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 4103. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the amount due O bah baum, and pay the same out of the fund known as "For the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 651. An act for the reimbursement of certain sums of money to certain enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 430. An act granting to the State of Oregon certain lands to be used by it for the purpose of maintaining and operating thereon a fish hatchery—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 208. An act for the survey and allotment of lands now embraced within the limits of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and the sale and disposal of all the surplus lands after allotment—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1893. An act granting an honorable discharge to Peter Fleming—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 7694. An act to provide for the purchase of ground for and the erection of a public building for an immigration station, on a site to be selected for said station, in the city of Philadelphia, Pa.

DAM ACROSS CAHABA RIVER, ALABAMA.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16051) to authorize the Centerville Power Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a dam across the Cahaba River, in said State, at or near Centerville, Ala.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Cahaba Power Company, a corporation organized under the laws of Alabama, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Cahaba River at Centerville, in the State of Alabama, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters," approved June 21, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, by reason of a misprint an amendment is necessary. I move to strike out the word "Cahaba," in line 3, and to insert the word "Centerville."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "Cahaba," in line 3, and insert the word "Centerville."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Director of the Mint, submitting an estimate of appropriation for doors for the vault of the mint at San Francisco—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting a statement in relation to the claim of the Philadelphia Supply Company, of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize repairs to the vessels of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a copy of a letter from the Quartermaster-General, a recom-

mentation as to appropriation for transportation of the Army and its supplies—to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of T. N. Rhodes, administrator of estate of Lewellen Rhodes, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Acting Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for officers and employees of the Isthmian Canal Commission—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of California, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11778) to amend an act approved June 11, 1906, entitled "An act to provide for the entry of agricultural lands within forest reserves," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 888), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2495) restoring certain tracts of public land in the State of Minnesota to the public domain, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 891), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAYES, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16652) to amend section 11 of an act entitled "An act to establish a bureau of immigration and naturalization and to provide for a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 893), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1215) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe A. Barteaux, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 796), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1508) granting an increase of pension to William M. Jordan, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 797), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2955) granting an increase of pension to James C. Booth, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 798), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2961) granting an increase of pension to Hazzard P. Gavitt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 799), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2999) granting a pension to George P. Matteson, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 800), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3164) granting an increase of pension to Osiah Attison, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 801), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3229) granting an increase of pension to William McCue, reported the

same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 802), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3232) granting an increase of pension to John Foster, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 803), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3243) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Copeland, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 804), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3244) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer L. Briggs, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 805), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3510) granting an increase of pension to Henry McCall, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 806), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3641) granting an increase of pension to John N. Dickerson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 807), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4103) granting an increase of pension to David M. Myers, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 808), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4128) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Corgill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 809), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pension, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4149) granting an increase of pension to John W. Armstrong, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 810), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4170) granting an increase of pension to Barnhardt Herber, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 811), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4290) granting an increase of pension to Howard F. Hess, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 812), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4416) granting an increase of pension to John H. Wells, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 813), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4651) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia H. Keyes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 814), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4678) granting an increase of pension to D. L. Arwine, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 815), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4758) granting an increase of pension to Edwin P. Gurney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 816), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5382) granting an increase of pension to John Bowen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 817), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions,

to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5803) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Harter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 818), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6035) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Fox, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 819), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6070) granting an increase of pension to W. F. Moyer, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 820), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6505) granting an increase of pension to John N. Kundert, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 821), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6538) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Grady, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 822), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6647) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth T. McCoy, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 823), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6688) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Steeley, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 824), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6819) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Clark, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 825), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6876) granting a pension to Carrie A. Chaplin, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 826), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7450) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Latlin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 827), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8061) granting an increase of pension to Archibald Huston, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 828), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8222) granting an increase of pension to Robert Simpson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 829), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8427) granting an increase of pension to John Gaffney, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 830), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8548) granting an increase of pension to Joseph T. Walker, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 831), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9331) granting an increase of pension to Francis H. Britton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 832), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9390) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Woodruff, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 833), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9695) granting

an increase of pension to Albert C. Lee, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 834), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9824) granting an increase of pension to William Hines, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 835), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9983) granting an increase of pension to James Burke, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 836), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10855) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Payne, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 837), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10954) granting an increase of pension to Russell Arnold, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 838), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11102) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wells, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 839), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11250) granting a pension to Louis P. Sothoron, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 840), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11522) granting an increase of pension to John Sonia, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 841), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11679) granting an increase of pension to Celina C. Fleming, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 842), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11891) granting an increase of pension to Albert W. Munger, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 843), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12081) granting an increase of pension to William H. Kellogg, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 844), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12234) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Monroe, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 845), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12252) granting an increase of pension to William B. Swisher, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 846), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12395) granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Clutter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 847), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12491) granting an increase of pension to Griffith T. Murphy, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 848), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12534) granting an increase of pension to Harvey Fowler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 849), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12719) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Searl, reported the

same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 850), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12735) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stump, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 851), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12766) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Woodruff, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 852), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12809) granting an increase of pension to Carlton Cross, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 853), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12849) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin R. Hardman, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 854), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12950) granting an increase of pension to Hylas S. Moore, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 855), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12992) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Coughlan, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 856), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOYD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13175) granting an increase of pension to David Miller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 857), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13190) granting an increase of pension to John Loughmiller, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 858), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13226) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Derland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 859), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13713) granting an increase of pension to Anton Gelser, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 860), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13889) granting an increase of pension to Martha Foster, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 861), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13916) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Bockins, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 862), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14199) granting an increase of pension to George Walton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 863), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14226) granting an increase of pension to George W. Child, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 864), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14232) granting an increase of pension to Reuben R. Pitman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 865), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14363) granting an increase of pension to Frank Schader, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 866), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14606) granting an increase of pension to Francis L. Smith, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 867), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14798) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Parker, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 868), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14958) granting an increase of pension to John L. Bennett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 869), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14969) granting an increase of pension to Abraham H. Tompkins, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 870), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15037) granting an increase of pension to Albert Falcon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 871), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15063) granting an increase of pension to Alex Mattison, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 872), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15071) granting an increase of pension to James M. Reed, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 873), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ANSBERRY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15280) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Taylor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 874), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15429) granting an increase of pension to W. R. Moore, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 875), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15475) granting an increase of pension to Fannie T. Shipley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 876), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15688) granting a pension to Martha A. Elliott, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 877), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15927) granting an increase of pension to William McGovern, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 878), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16016) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Bruce, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 879), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16194) granting a pension to William F. Paris, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 880), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KIPP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16237) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Bonnell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 881), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16308) granting an increase of pension to Daniel C. Foster, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 882), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 57) granting a pension to Alvah Moulton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 883), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 638) granting a pension to Emily Ayres, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 884), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 920) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Kenny, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 885), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1171) granting a pension to Mary A. Sands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 886), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2420) granting an increase of pension to Margaret K. Hern, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 887), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. VOLSTEAD, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 720) to confirm an entry made by Gertrude Halverson Aaby, widow of Sigbjorn H. Aaby, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 890), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRONNA, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1666) for the relief of Stene Engeberg, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 892), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles, which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3303) granting a pension to Louisa J. Avey—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 8408) granting a pension to Mary M. Daniels—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12533) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Lyon—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14368) granting a pension to Sterling A. Galt—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14622) granting a pension to Clara D. Miller—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 15473) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. L. Hawk—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16626) authorizing and empowering rural mail carriers to certify pension vouchers for pensioners who reside upon the routes of said carriers, respectively, and for other purposes—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 16957) of the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Gardiner, Me.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 16958) increasing the limit of cost for the erection of United States post-office building at Chippewa Falls, Wis.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 16959) to equalize and fix the pay of professors of mathematics, naval constructors, and civil engineers in the Navy—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 16960) to provide for a duty on mica and to encourage the mica industry in the United States—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 16961) for the distribution of the funds of the Five Civilized Tribes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16962) for the removal of restrictions from part of the lands of allottees of the Five Civilized Tribes, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 16963) to declare that part of Cache River running through Woodruff County, Ark., non-navigable for purposes of commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 16964) ratifying an act of the legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona providing for the erection of a court-house and jail at Yuma, Yuma County, Territory of Arizona—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 16965) to repair a portion of the roadway to the national cemetery at Staunton, Va., and to keep said portion of said road in repair—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16966) for the relief of the tobacco growers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16967) to provide for the free importation of saws, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 16968) to amend section 86 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 16969) authorizing the leasing of Indian lands on the Uncompahgre and Uintah Reservations in Utah—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 16970) for the erection of a torpedo station for the use of the United States Navy near the mouth of the Neponset River, in the city of Quincy, Mass.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 16971) providing for a superintendent of buildings and supplies on the board of education for the city of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 16972) for acquiring a national forest preserve in the Highlands of the Hudson—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 16973) to place lumber on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16974) to provide for the free importation of wire fencing, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16975) to place petroleum, crude or refined, or the products of petroleum, crude or refined, on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: A bill (H. R. 16976) to distribute the surplus in the Treasury of the United States among the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia for the purpose of improving the post roads therein—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 16977) for free lectures—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16978) to amend the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LARRINAGA: A bill (H. R. 16979) to amend an act approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico," and for other purposes—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 16980) to ratify a certain lease with the Seneca Nation of Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MADISON: A bill (H. R. 16981) amending section 20 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended June 29, 1906—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 16982) to repeal the law providing for a duty on crude petroleum and its products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 16983) to fix requirements governing the receipt, delivery, and preservation of telegraph messages—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 16984) regulating interstate and foreign commerce in spirituous, vinous, and malt liquors, and intoxicating liquors of all kinds—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 16985) to regulate interstate commerce in intoxicating liquors—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 16986) to establish a fish hatchery and fish station in the Ninth Congressional District of Georgia—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 16987) amending section 4463 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 16988) to establish in the Department of Agriculture a bureau to be known as the Bureau of Public Highways, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 16989) to authorize additional aids to navigation in the Light-House Establishment, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON: Memorial from the legislature of Oklahoma relative to segregation of lands in Oklahoma for timber and game purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYD: A bill (H. R. 16990) granting an increase of pension to John Dineen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16991) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Delaney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 16992) granting an increase of pension to Rosanna A. Fitzpatrick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 16993) granting a pension to Sarah R. Lewis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: A bill (H. R. 16994) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Pinkerton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 16995) granting a pension to Sarah E. Wilkin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 16996) to place Louis Weber, a first-class musician, late of the Marine Corps, on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16997) for the relief of the heirs of Jerry Hughes, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 16998) granting an increase of pension to Charles Edward Putnam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 16999) for the relief of D. M. Rowland—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 17000) to provide for the removal of restrictions of alienation on the homestead of James R. Oliver, an intermarried Choctaw citizen—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 17001) granting an increase of pension to George M. Lally—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 17002) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John T. Johnson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17003) to remove the charge of desertion from the naval record of Patrick J. Skelly—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 17004) granting an increase of pension to David M. Wiswander—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 17005) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church for certain lands in the State of Idaho—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 17006) for the relief of the estate of David F. Kennel—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 17007) in behalf of Oscar J. Bigelow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOEBEL: A bill (H. R. 17008) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Messinger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 17009) authorizing the Court of Claims to investigate and report the facts on the claims of Emmetta Humphreys, administratrix of Gen. John Sevier and of John Sevier, jr.—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 17010) granting a pension to Marion C. Turrill—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 17011) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 17012) granting an increase of pension to William K. Griffith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 17013) granting an increase of pension to T. Fleming Lent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17014) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Sampson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 17015) to amend the record of the War Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LILLEY: A bill (H. R. 17016) granting an increase of pension to Byron Bradford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 17017) granting an increase of pension to Newell Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17018) granting an increase of pension to Granville C. Poor—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17019) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Lapham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17020) granting an increase of pension to Ansel G. Marston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17021) granting a pension to Daniel Liner—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17022) to refund certain excess charges, and so forth—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 17023) granting a pension to Mary E. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 17024) for the relief of John Hannah, alias John Hunter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17025) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MALBY: A bill (H. R. 17026) for the relief of Samuel L. Barnhart—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Texas: A bill (H. R. 17027) granting an increase of pension to George W. Duncan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 17028) granting a pension to Delos W. Story—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 17029) granting a pension to Mary J. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 17030) for the relief of Anne H. Rainey and heirs of William S. Rainey—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 17031) granting a pension to David Hubert—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 17032) granting a pension to Jesse W. Huffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 17033) granting a pension to Jesse T. Atchison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STURGISS: A bill (H. R. 17034) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Smith, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 17035) granting a pension to Kate Arkebauer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Philip S. Fletcher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a petition of National German-American Alliance, for forest reservations in White Mountains and southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petitions of St. John Electrotypers' Union and the St. Louis Mailers' Union, for removal of duty on wood pulp, white paper, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, for forest reservations in White Mountains and southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of National Supreme Lodge Jednota Taborita and Bohemian-Slavonic Benevolent Society, C. S. P. S., against all prohibition bills—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, against immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of D. R. Reynolds, favoring the Kittredge copyright bill (S. 2900)—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 77, International Typographical Union, of Erie, Pa., for repeal of duty on white paper, wood pulp, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Erie Chamber of Commerce, favoring H. R. 534, relative to agricultural and mechanic art schools—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of G. A. Fleugel, of Erie, Pa., for amendment of the copyright law in the interest of musical composers—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of board of education of Erie, Pa., for appropriation for agricultural high schools—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. F. Davidson, for forest reservations in White Mountains and southern Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Board of Trade of Erie, Pa., favoring civil-service rules for employees for taking next census—to the Committee on the Census.

Also, petition of Jacob E. Swap, for a volunteer officers' retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of H. V. Kilpatrick—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Spring City, Pa., for the Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of South Brooklyn Board of Trade, favoring construction of battle ships in Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of many citizens of Florida, for appropriation to open the St. Johns River to navigation from Lake Harney to Lake Poinsett—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOK of Pennsylvania: Petition of National German-American Alliance, against any bill changing immigration laws until investigation commission has reported—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of National German-American Alliance, against immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Richardson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Bowser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of National German-American Alliance, against any change of immigration laws until investigation by commission is completed—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of New York State League, against any amendment of immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, against immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Deutsche Verein of La Crosse, Wis., against any liquor prohibition legislation—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Petition of citizens of Kent, Oreg., for the Littlefield original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 58, International Typographical Union, of Portland, Oreg., for repeal of duty on white paper, wood pulp, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOCHT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Henry Lamp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of V. R. Anderson and other merchants of Rockford, Ill., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David F. Kennel—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petitions of Proctor Brothers, editors of Gloucester Daily Times, and Charles A. King, editor of Beverly Citizen, against order issued by Postmaster-General of December 4, 1907, directing postmasters to refuse acceptance of copies of publications mailed to subscribers more than one year in arrears, except at the transient second-class postage rate of 1 cent for each 4 ounces thereof—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petitions of Local Union No. 892, International Brother-

hood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Dedham; also, Grand Council of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of Massachusetts; Local Union No. 259, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Salem; Local Union No. 1351, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Fitchburg; Local Union No. 293, United Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America; Local Union No. 1105, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Springfield; Berkshire District Council, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Pittsfield, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring submission to voters of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States striking out the word "male" from the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Petition of John Campbell Post, No. 204, of Cincinnati, Ohio, for passage of Sherwood bill (H. R. 7625)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of National German-American Alliance, against immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of J. H. Nowbray, of Bronx Borough, New York City, protesting against amending copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of town council of Westerly, R. I., for bill to promote efficiency of the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Citizens' Business Association of Newport, R. I., favoring the fortifications bill or such part thereof as may apply to the defenses of Narragansett Bay—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petition of Local Union No. 148, of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, for removal of duty on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Andrew Vatne and 60 other citizens of Coopertown, N. Dak., for the Hepburn original-package bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILL: Petition of Local Union No. 94, printers of Bayonne, N. J., for removal of duty on white paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of typographical unions of San Francisco and San Jose, Cal., for removal of duty on white paper, wood pulp, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of General George G. Meade Post, No. 48, Grand Army of the Republic, of San Francisco, Cal., for pension for civil-war veterans of \$40 per month—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of San Francisco, asking that right of naturalization be not extended and that oriental laborers be excluded from this country—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Napoleon McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petition of Spokane Chamber of Commerce, for amendment of H. R. 7597 (Crumpacker bill), relative to census employees, in accordance with civil-service laws—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Documents and records to accompany H. R. 12123—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNAPP: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles W. Murdock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of David E. Tatum—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Tittle—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: Petition of East Corinth (Me.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, for legislation to prevent circulation of intoxicating liquor advertisements—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Henry T. Howell and John Hannah—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MALBY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Samuel L. Barnhart—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of third-class postmasters of Third Congressional District, Nebraska, for increase in allowance for clerk hire in third-class offices from \$500 to \$1,300—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Nebraska, against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PADGETT: Papers to accompany bills for relief of estate of A. K. Stewart, estate of John M. Winstead, Alexander Bennett, William W. Small, Lemuel Long, estate of Mrs. Z. R. Tacker, estate of A. B. Rozell, estate of John F. Redmond, and estate of J. R. Jeter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of S. E. Wither-
spoon and A. Truett—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petition of Local Union No. 342, International Typographical Union, for repealing duty on white paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas. Petition of citizens of Burleson, Greenville, Montague, and Nocona, all in the State of Texas, for H. R. 10507, to exterminate the green bug—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of National German-American Alliance, against any change in immigration laws until investigation of commissioners is made—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, for S. 3152, for additional protection for the dairy interests—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of National German-American Alliance, against any law changing immigration laws until Commissioner's report is submitted—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Local Union No. 58, Utica Printing Pressmen and Assistants, of Utica, N. Y., for repeal of duty on white paper, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of Denton County Farmers' Union, for legislation to prevent gambling in futures in cotton and other farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of mass meeting of the Poles, against Polish expropriation bill of the Legislatures of Prussia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, for repeal of the so-called "canteen law"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George William Harris, Cornell University library, against certain provisions in S. 2900 and H. R. 11794 against free importation by libraries of copies of foreign publications—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William Speers, for amendment to copyright bill favorable to musical composers—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of National German-American Alliance, against immigration legislation—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 13, 1908.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

TRADE CONDITIONS IN AUSTRALASIA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of Special Agent Harry R. Burrill on trade conditions of Australasia, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Bellefonte, Ala., v. United States;

In the cause of the trustees of the Downing Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Oak Hall, Va., v. United States;

In the cause of the trustees of the Christian Church of Franklin, Tenn., v. United States;

In the cause of the trustees of St. Mark's German Reformed Church, of Gettysburg, Pa., v. United States;

In the cause of the trustees of the Christian Church of Union City, Tenn., v. United States;

In the cause of the trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Charleston, Tenn., v. United States;

In the cause of Albert V. Conway, trustee, v. United States;

In the cause of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Deep Creek, Va., v. United States;

In the cause of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Mexico, Mo., v. United States;

In the cause of Hannah Nally, executrix of William A. Nally, deceased, v. United States; and

In the cause of the trustees of the Baptist Church of Harrodsburg, Ky., v. United States.

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 16050) to authorize the Interstate Transfer Railway Company to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 15219) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented memorials of sundry organizations of St. Paul, Minn.; Bellows Falls, Vt.; Richmond, Va.; Savannah, Ga.; Wheeling, W. Va.; Washington, D. C.; Brighton, Colo.; Cullman, Ala.; and Mobile, Ala., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Merchant Tailors' National Protective Association of America, of New York City, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill," which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Ohio Personal Liberty League, of Cincinnati, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Elma, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prevent Sunday banking in post-offices in the handling of money orders and registered letters, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Ithaca, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish laboratories under State, Federal, and city governments for a scientific study of the conditions of criminal paupers, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 135, International Typographical Union, of Oneonta, N. Y., praying for the repeal of the duty on white paper, wood pulp, and the materials used in the manufacture thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the National German-American Alliance, of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against any change being made in the present immigration law, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ballston Spa, Brooklyn, Canisteo, Chatham, Jamestown, Lowville, Niagara Falls, Olean, Rome, Schenectady, and Seneca Falls, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the adoption of a certain amendment to the present copyright law relating to photographic reproduction, which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. WARNER presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the inspection of grain under Federal control, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ashland, Hinsdale, Keene, and Peterboro, all in the State of New Hampshire; of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C.; Urbana, Ill.; Crescent, Cal.; and La Grange and Buffalo, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of sundry volunteer officers of the civil war of Mendota, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to create a volunteer retired list in the War and Navy Departments for the surviving officers of the civil war, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TALIAFERRO presented a petition of Clardy Chapel, Local Union No. 107, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative